

MAR 12 1917
UNIV. OF MICH.
LIBRARY

The Classical Journal

PUBLISHED BY THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE MIDDLE WEST AND SOUTH
WITH THE CO-OPERATION OF THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW ENGLAND
AND THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE PACIFIC STATES

Volume XII

NOVEMBER 1916

Number 2

Editorial

81

On Certain Ancient Errors in Geographical Orientation

Elmer T. Merrill 88

The Prosecution of Murena

Richard Wellington Husband 102

The Sources of the *Odyssey*

John A. Scott 119

The Dorchester Experiment in Vocational Latin: A Report of Progress

Albert S. Perkins 131

Notes

Appreciation of Nature in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*
Xenophon *Anabasis* I, 8, 13

John A. Scott 145
Charles Knapp 146

General Comment

149

Book Reviews:

155

Zeno: *A Study in Ancient Religion*, Cook (Bonner); *A Handbook for Latin Clubs*, Paxson (Miller); *A Handbook of American Private Schools*, Sargent (Miller); *The "Germania" of Tacitus*, Stuart (Kingery).

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, U.S.A.

AGENTS

THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, LONDON AND EDINBURGH

KARL W. HIERSEMANN, LEIPZIG

THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA, TOKYO, OSAKA, KYOTO,
FUKUOKA, SENDAI

THE MISSION BOOK COMPANY, SHANGHAI

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

Published by the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, with the co-operation
of the Classical Association of New England, and the Classical Association
of the Pacific States

Managing Editors

FRANK J. MILLER
University of Chicago

ARTHUR T. WALKER
University of Kansas

For New England
MONROE N. WETMORE
Williams College

For the Pacific States
HERBERT C. NUTTING
University of California

Associate Editors

GEORGE H. CHASE
Harvard University

FREDERICK C. EASTMAN
University of Iowa

CLARENCE W. GLEASON
Roxbury Latin School, Boston

DANIEL W. LOTHMAN
East High School, Cleveland

WALTER MILLER
University of Missouri

JOHN A. SCOTT
Northwestern University

GILBERT C. SCOGGIN
University of Missouri

JULIANNE A. ROLLER
Franklin High School, Portland, Oregon

BERTHA GREEN
Hollywood High School, Los Angeles

The Classical Journal is published monthly except in July, August, and September. The subscription price is \$2.50 per year; the price of single copies is 30 cents. Orders for service of less than a half-year will be charged at the single-copy rate. Postage is prepaid by the publishers on all orders from the United States, Mexico, Cuba, Porto Rico, Panama Canal Zone, Republic of Panama, Hawaiian Islands, Philippine Islands, Guam, Samoan Islands, Shanghai. Postage is charged extra as follows: For Canada, 15 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$2.65); on single copies, 2 cents (total 32 cents). For all other countries in the Postal Union, 24 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$2.74); on single copies, 3 cents (total, 33 cents). Patrons are requested to make all remittances payable to The University of Chicago Press in postal or express money orders or bank drafts.

The following agents have been appointed and are authorized to quote the prices indicated:

For the British Empire: THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, Fetter Lane, London, E.C. Yearly subscriptions including postage, £1. 3*s*. each; single copies, including postage, 1*s*. 4*d*. each.

For the Continent of Europe: KARL W. HIERSEMANN, Königstrasse 29, Leipzig, Germany. Yearly subscriptions, including postage, M. 13. 70 each; single copies, including postage, M. 1. 65 each.

For Japan and Korea: THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA, 11 to 16 Nihonbashi Tori San-chome, Tokyo, Japan. Yearly subscriptions, including postage, Yen 5.50 each; single copies, including postage, Yen 0.66 each.

For China: THE MISSION BOOK COMPANY, 18 Peking Road, Shanghai. Yearly subscriptions, \$2.50; single copies, 30 cents, or their equivalents in Chinese money. Postage extra, if mailed direct outside of Shanghai, on yearly subscriptions 24 cents, on single copies 3 cents.

Claims for missing numbers should be made within the month following the regular month of publication. The publishers expect to supply missing numbers free only when they have been lost in transit.

Business correspondence should be addressed as follows:

1. Concerning membership in the Classical Association of the Middle West and South to LOUIS E. LOHN, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio. The territory of the Association includes Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming. The membership fee is \$2.00 per year to residents of this territory.

2. Concerning membership in the Classical Association of New England to GEORGE E. HOWES, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass. The membership fee is \$2.00 per year to residents of this territory.

3. Concerning membership in the Classical Association of the Pacific States to M. E. DEUTSCH, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. The territory of this association includes California, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, and Arizona. The membership fee is \$2.00 per year to residents of this territory.

4. Concerning subscriptions (not related to membership) to THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS, Chicago, Ill.

Communications for the editors and manuscripts should be sent either to FRANK J. MILLER, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., or to ARTHUR T. WALKER, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kan.; from New England contributors, to MONROE N. WETMORE, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass., and from the Pacific States to HERBERT C. NUTTING, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.

Fifty reprints of articles will be furnished gratis to authors. Additional copies, if ordered in advance of publication, will be supplied at cost.

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

VOLUME XII

NOVEMBER 1916

NUMBER 2

Editorial

REPORT OF THE TREASURER OF THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE MIDDLE WEST AND SOUTH

[It has hitherto been customary to publish the financial affairs of our Association only through the medium of the Treasurer's report read at the annual meeting. It has seemed to the present Executive Committee, however, that information of such importance should be spread before the whole Association.—Ed.]

At the last annual meeting the Association voted that the fiscal year should hereafter close on August 31. The report here submitted, therefore, covers the operations of the Association from May 1, 1915, to August 31, 1916.

A few explanations may be added. Funds were received from: (1) membership dues; these amounted to \$3,901.33; (2) commissions from the University of Chicago Press, \$1,003.62; this represents the proceeds from the sale of the *Classical Journal* outside the territory of the Association; (3) the balance carried over from last year, \$931.43.

The payments to the University of Chicago Press amounted to \$3,790.82. This includes the amount paid for the publication of the *Classical Journal*, the purchase of *Classical Philology*, and the expenses of the office of the Editor of the *Classical Journal*. The balance shown below represents the difference between this amount and the commission paid to the Association by the University of Chicago Press. The expense for printing and postage covers the amount spent in the Secretary's office and by the Vice-Presidents in their campaigns for new members. For clerical help in the

Secretary's office \$308.47 was expended and on the annual meeting of the Association, \$111.01. This included the honorarium paid to the visiting speaker, the cost of printing programs, mailing, etc. The "sundries" account includes office supplies, the principal item being a typewriter. The sum of \$200.00 has been appropriated by the Association for publicity. Of this amount \$120.24 has been spent by the committee of which Professor C. H. Weller is chairman. The receipts from the sale of pamphlets issued by this committee has been \$82.11; so that, although \$202.35 has actually been spent for this purpose, there still remains a balance of \$79.76 available for the use of the committee. Cash on hand amounts to \$970.50.

Below are submitted copies of the balanced account and the auditors' statement.

SUMMARY OF THE ACCOUNTS OF THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE MIDDLE
WEST AND SOUTH FROM MAY 1, 1915, TO AUGUST 31, 1916

Expenses	Receipts
University of Chicago Press \$2,787.20	Memberships \$3,901.33
Printing 203.16	Balance from former Treasurer 931.43
Postage 266.43	
Clerical help 308.47	
Annual meeting 111.01	
Sundries 65.75	
Special appropriation 120.24	
Cash on hand 970.50	
 Total \$4,832.76	 Total \$4,832.76

We have examined the foregoing accounts of the Treasurer of the Classical Association of the Middle West and South and have found them correct.

(Signed) E. L. FINDLEY
CLARENCE BILL
LEIGH ALEXANDER
Auditing Committee

September 23, 1916

Respectfully submitted,
(Signed) LOUIS E. LORD, Treasurer

OLD SCHOOLS FOR NEW

In *A Modern School*, a pamphlet written by Abraham Flexner and published last spring under the auspices of the General Education Board, the classical student will find much to make him pause

and wonder what manner of educated man would come forth as the finished product of the educational scheme therein so extravagantly recommended. Like the socialists, the modern faddists in education display slight harmony of doctrine within their own ranks; and from the confused welter of conflicting individual opinions there emerges merely a blind determination to overthrow the existing order of things. Starting with President Eliot's belief that tradition enters too largely into our educational fabric, Mr. Flexner at once plunges head over heels *in medias res*: "Generally speaking, it may be safely affirmed that the subjects commonly taught, the manner in which they are taught, and the amounts taught are determined by tradition, not by a fresh and untrammelled consideration of living and present needs." In other words, it seems unreasonable to him that the experience of many generations of teachers should have led to any particular scheme of content and method in education. Yet he admits that there have been good teachers, for he says that "sometimes through the personality of the teacher, less often through the congeniality of the subject-matter, Latin and algebra may seem as real to particular students as woodwork, Shakespeare, biology, or current events."

Naturally enough, he assails the study of formal grammar, that bugbear of the idle, the shiftless, and the incompetent: "Such evidence as we possess points to the futility of formal grammar as an aid to correct speaking and writing." On every page are heaped reckless statements, such as, for instance, the assertion that "failure is so widespread that the only habits acquired through failing to learn Latin or algebra are habits of slipshod work; of guessing and of mechanical application of formulae, not themselves understood." It would be nearer the truth to admit that the slovenly habits here enumerated are inherent in the great mass of pupils who now throng the halls of our schools; and if entertainment can be provided for them elsewhere it would be a great boon for those who have serious intellectual interests to be relieved of their depressing presence. So long as they are with us they must be beguiled with toys and rattles such as those invented long ago by Archytas to keep children from tearing up the furniture; and all this clatter interferes with the real business of education. But to ascribe the failure of mediocre pupils

to the educational system should furnish our logicians with an interesting example of *post hoc ergo propter hoc*.

Then again we are told that "the literature that most schools teach is partly obsolete, partly ill-timed, rarely effective or appealing." Spenser in particular seems to have incurred the great displeasure of Mr. Flexner. Now it is doubtless true that most people of education will be ready to admit, what no less a man of letters than Mr. Howells has somewhere admitted with reference to one of the greatest poetic productions of modern times, *In Memoriam*, that they have never read the *Faerie Queene* from beginning to end. Professor Lanman would probably admit the same with reference to the *Mahābhārata*, and most of us will admit the same with reference to the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Yet one of America's greatest scholars, a teacher who had a profound influence upon his pupils and whose memory is still revered wherever true scholarship is appreciated, an American, I say, has given us the best edition of Spenser's works; and "a gentle Knight" he was, ever ready to defend all that goes to make life better and nobler. However, it is not Spenser alone that fails to measure up to Mr. Flexner's requirements; the modern school "would not begin with classics nor would it necessarily end with them." Our pupils, it seems, are to be given only what an undeveloped taste may happen to like. By starting with the Sunday supplement the modern school might in the end raise the standard of the pupil's taste to the point where he might be able to enjoy *Mushey-Mushey, the Soft Book*; the modern school would have "the courage not to read obsolete and uncongenial classics." We must confess that to us this last smacks, not of courage, but of foolhardiness. We cannot force our pupils to accept the best that is known and thought in the world, but every teacher worthy of the name will bring such things to the notice of those under his charge. Many, no doubt to his chagrin, will reject the proffered gold, *καθάπερ Ἡράκλειτός φησιν ὅνον σύρματ' ἀν ἐλέσθαι μᾶλλον η χρυσόν*. True literature can never grow obsolete. The Vedas, Homer, Virgil, Dante, yea even Milton and Spenser, will continue to be read and admired, *in the original*, long after *Mushey-Mushey* has been rehashed, refried, re-served, and finally consigned to the literary swill-can.

After reading such wholesale denunciation of the things that go to make up our curriculum, we are astounded, but withal refreshed, at Mr. Flexner's modesty when he informs us that he is not qualified to speak about art and music! Naturally enough, Greek and Latin are to be ousted from the modern school: "Neither Greek nor Latin would be contained in the curriculum of the modern school—not, of course, because their literatures are less wonderful than they are reputed to be, but because their present position in the curriculum rests on tradition and assumption." Here we have the secret of Mr. Flexner's animosity; he is violently opposed to tradition and convention. He rejoices to think that "teachers can be found who have already passed conventional limits." We will only remark in passing that our prisons are filled with members of society who have "passed conventional limits"; for society is based on convention. One of the wisest men that ever lived laid down the general principle that the world desires, not what is traditional, but what is good—goodness being the quality that should recommend a thing to us, whether it be ancient or modern. The modern school would reject Latin and Greek, "not because their literatures are less wonderful than they are reputed to be," but because they are "traditional." What a sorry contrast such a narrow mental attitude makes when compared with the liberal, unprejudiced view expressed by "the master of those who know." Unlike Shadwell, Mr. Flexner occasionally "deviates into sense" and becomes a strong pleader for the humanistic ideal. For the moment we seem to be listening to an Oxford don, when he says that "the modern school would from the first undertake the cultivation of contacts and cross-connections. Every exercise would be a spelling-lesson; science, industry, and mathematics would be inseparable; science, industry, history, civics, literature, and geography would to some extent utilize the same material." He admits that this sensible conception of education is not original with him nor even new, for that matter. However, he fails to add that this humanistic ideal has been sullied by the modernists themselves, who have thrust into our curriculum an infinite variety of uncorrelated courses often consisting of the veriest banalities. I have even heard a teacher of sociology say that he refused to consider such a small point as

spelling when correcting papers in sociology. The fact is that at the present time there is a widespread tendency to insist upon what, by oxymoron, may be termed the superiority of the mediocre. This dangerous tendency may now be seen in all walks and professions. The dean of a certain school of education has even declared in print that mediocre students make the best teachers! As a certain shrewd observer has recently pointed out, people are now giving so much time to the study of morons and imbeciles that there is a real danger lest we come to look upon our bright pupils as mentally defective in so far as they differ from the idiot. Many years ago a distinguished Hellenist remarked that, "while we are anxious to hide or relieve the degradation to which human nature can sink, we tend to become less careful of the elevation to which it can rise; we put feeling in the place of thought, and throw away half our birthright." The present situation brought about by the modernists reminds us of that tale of Poe's wherein are recounted the queer antics of a band of lunatics in an asylum, who overpowered their keepers and in turn confined them and treated them as proper inmates of a madhouse. Naturally enough, statistics loom large on Mr. Flexner's mental horizon, and he regrets that we do not have card catalogues that would enable us to determine just how many pupils fail to master Latin, algebra, and geometry. What good would come from counting the noses of these students is not clear. They have failed to stand the mental test and the educator should be relieved of them straightway. As for the fact that the large majority of pupils fail to stand high in intellectual contests, this is true because, like poor Walter Simmons of Spoon River, they don't have the brains. They should be set to learning more humble trades which will be less exacting of their mental powers. Even here the greater number will helplessly fail.

My parents thought that I would be
As great as Edison or greater:
For as a boy I made balloons
And wondrous kites and toys with clocks
And little engines with tracks to run on
And telephones of cans and thread.
I played the cornet and painted pictures,
Modeled in clay and took the part

Of the villain in the *Octoroon*.
But then at twenty-one I married
And had to live, and so, to live
I learned the trade of making watches
And kept a jewelry store on the square,
Thinking, thinking, thinking, thinking,—
Not of business, but of the engine
I studied the calculus to build.
And all Spoon River watched and waited
To see it work, but it never worked.
And a few kind souls believed my genius
Was somehow hampered by the store.
It wasn't true. The truth was this:
I didn't have the brains.

G. C. S.

ON CERTAIN ANCIENT ERRORS IN GEOGRAPHICAL ORIENTATION

BY ELMER T. MERRILL
University of Chicago

The schoolboy of my childhood, who after a spoon-diet of comminuted and predigested sentences was plunged into Caesar's *Gallic War* for his first solid Latin pabulum, found himself confronted in the initial chapter with somewhat of a geographical puzzle. Caesar appeared to say (though in decidedly curious manner) that the central of the three divisions of Gaul lay to the northward of the Rhone territory, and was flanked on the right by the land of the Belgae, which stretched to the northeast, and on the left by Aquitania, which was situated to the northwest. The schoolmaster doubtless informed the youngster, in accordance with the sole remark of the wisest commentators of the day, that Caesar was speaking from an assumed standpoint in the Province. That was well enough; but even so, the map showed that the Belgae were planted more nearly north of the Province, the Celtæ northwest, and the Aquitani west. But as no further explanation was forthcoming, the schoolboy usually classed his puzzle as one of the unreasonable curiosities of Latin expression, and thought nothing more of it. If he had waited till a later time, he would have found certain wise men to assure him that Caesar himself never wrote such Latin as that in the last three sections of the first chapter; but they would have proffered him no further help as to the concept of the pseudo-Caesar who did write them. Nor would the editors who, apparently with some sense of a manifest difficulty, have tried to explain the statement as pertaining to drainage areas, watersheds, and the like, have afforded him much satisfaction.

With further reading other problems of similar unexplained character confronted him. For example, Caesar's description of Britain (*B.G.* v. 13) was hard to understand. The island is said

to be triangular in shape, with one side parallel to the coast of Gaul; and of this side one extremity is declared to lie toward the east, the other toward the south. That might pass; but the length of the side is given as *circiter milia passuum quingenta*, which is far too great, and furthermore the second side of the island *qua ex parte est Hibernia* is said to stretch toward Spain and the west (*alterum uergit ad Hispaniam atque occidentem solem*). That statement is certainly on its face difficult to comprehend. If that extremity of this second side which meets the first is meant, that angle has already been affirmed to lie to the southward (*inferior [sc. angulus] ad meridiem spectat*); if the other end of the second side is meant, the implication is of an obtuse angle at the point of junction, a protraction of the second side of Britain in practically an east-west direction, and the extension of Spain far out into the Atlantic, so that the westernmost extremity of the second side shall lie opposite that country, and presumably therefore not far removed from it by intervening waters. We must, however, conceive Ireland as lying between the somewhat parallel coasts of Britain on the north side and Gaul-Spain on the south. Later critics have assigned this passage also to the same pseudo-Caesar who is alleged to have written *B.G.* i. 1. 5-7, but at all events his meaning sorely needs explanation.

Yet Caesar, or the pseudo-Caesar, is not the only ancient writer who puts Spain opposite Britain, and also apparently thinks of their respective coasts as substantially parallel, taking no account, one may infer, of the great indentation of the Bay of Biscay, nor of the projection of Brittany, but regarding the Spanish and Gallic shores as continuous in the same straight line. To Strabo, for example, Britain is triangular in shape, with its longest side parallel to the Gallic coast and extending from a point opposite the mouth of the Rhine to the heights of the Pyrenees beyond Aquitania. He furthermore appears to conceive these parallel coasts as running in an east-west direction, but places Ireland to the north of Britain, as do also some other writers (e.g., Mela iii. 53): cf. Strab. 199 f.: 'Η δὲ Βρεττανικὴ τρίγωνος μέν ἔστι τῷ σχήματι, παραβέβληται δὲ τὸ μέγιστον αὐτῆς πλευρὸν τῇ Κελτικῇ . . . τὸ ἀπὸ Καντίου τοῦ καταντικρὺ τῶν ἐκβολῶν τοῦ Ρήνου . . . μεχρὶ πρὸς τὸ ἐσπέριον ἄκρον τῆς

νήσου τὸ κατὰ τὴν Ἀκυτανίαν καὶ τὴν Πυρήνην ἀντικείμενον. . . . ἡ Ἰέρνη πρὸς ἄρκτον αὐτῆ [sc. τῇ Βρεττανικῇ] παραβεβλημένη. Appian also apparently thought of Britain as extending to a point opposite and near to Spain, for he affirms (*Iβηρ.* 1) that the Spaniards take advantage of the tidal currents to cross into Britain, accomplishing the journey in half a day! He must accordingly have thought of Ireland as lying to the north of Britain instead of to the south. The elder Pliny shows much better and more detailed knowledge of Britain than does Caesar (or the pseudo-Caesar), but he also says that Britain lies opposite Germany, Gaul, and Spain (*N.H.* iv. 102: *Britannia . . . inter septentrionem et occidentem iacet, Germaniae, Galliae, Hispaniae . . . aduersa*). As regards the shape of Britain, Tacitus is better informed than his predecessors: he has learned from the campaigns of Agricola that the triangular form assigned to the island hardly corresponds to the fact, though it is more nearly true of Britain proper, while Caledonia stretches as an addition far northward, and tapers away to a wedge-like form (*Agr.* 10). But he also speaks of Britain as lying opposite Germany, Gaul, and Spain, and also makes the parallel coast lines run east-west (*Agr.* 10: *Britannia . . . in orientem Germaniae in occidentem Hispaniae obtenditur, Gallis in meridiem etiam inspicitur; II posita contra Hispania* [i.e., *contra Silures*]). He definitely states, what is reasonably inferred from *Caes. B.G.* v. 13. 2, that Ireland lies between Britain and Spain (*Agr.* 24: *Hibernia medio inter Britanniam atque Hispaniam sita*). Orosius presents the same view as Tacitus regarding the situation of Britain and Ireland (*Adu. Pag.* i. 2. 75 f.: *insulas quae Britanniam et Hiberniam uocant, quae in auersa Galliarum parte ad prospectum Hispaniae sitae sunt . . . Britannia oceani insula per longam in Boream extenditur; a meridie Gallias habet . . . Hibernia insula inter Britanniam et Hispaniam sita . . .*).

But it is unnecessary to multiply examples of ancient descriptions of Britain. One or two of other localities may be mentioned.

Polybius prides himself on the accuracy of his geographical knowledge, and censures other writers for their carelessness and ignorance in that field. When describing the march of Hannibal from the Rhone into Italy, he takes occasion to inform us (iii. 48 *fin.*)

that he had himself examined the region, and even crossed the Alps by Hannibal's route in order to assure himself of the truth by his own eyes. Yet he declares that Hannibal after his passage of the Rhone marched up the river eastward as if bound for the central region of Europe (iii. 47: *παρὰ τὸν ποταμὸν ἀπὸ θαλάττης ὡς ἐπὶ τὴν ζῷ, ποιούμενος τὴν πορείαν ὡς εἰς τὴν μεσόγαιον τῆς Εὐρώπης*). That this is no slip of the pen is made evident by his more formal statement of the topography of the region. Italy, he tells us (ii. 14), is triangular in shape,¹ bounded on the east by the Ionian Sea and the Adriatic Gulf, on the south and west by the Sicilian and Tyrrhene seas. The base of the triangle is formed by the limiting range of the Alps, which stretches across (2,200 stadia) from "the neighborhood of Marseilles" to a short distance from the head of the Adriatic. Polybius certainly regarded the Alps as extending from west to east in substantially a straight line (cf. also his description of the triangular shape of the Po valley), instead of curving up far northward. The Rhone, he declares (iii. 47), rises among the heights on the northern slope of the Alps, and flows a little south of west to the Sardinian Sea (δὲ Ἱοδανὸς ἔχει τὰς μὲν πηγὰς ἐν τοῖς ἀποκλίνοντι μέρεσι τῶν Ἀλπεων ὡς πρὸς τὰς ἄρκτους, ἥει δὲ πρὸς δύσεις χειμερινάς, ἐκβάλλει δ' εἰς τὸ Σαρδάρων πέλαγος). On its north bank dwells the Keltic tribe of the Ardyes; its south bank is flanked all the way by the northern foothills of the Alps (*ibid.*).

One might reasonably suppose that Tacitus must have been personally acquainted with the topography of the island of Capri, but thus he describes it (*Ann. iv. 67*): *Caeli tempesties hieme mitis obiectu montis, quo saeva uentorum arcentur; aestas in Fauonium obuersa et aperta circum pelago peramoena.* This would seem to indicate that to his mind the longer axis of the island lay in a north-south direction, so that the main settlement, which doubtless in his day, as in ours, was situated on the saddle between the heights that rise at either end of the island, was sheltered from the cold northern blasts of winter by the barrier of the mountain above Anacapri, while it enjoyed a tempered summer climate by reason of looking out westward over the open sea. But as a fact the

¹ Other ancient geographers represent the Italian peninsula as much broader in proportion at the north than it really is.

island lies east-west, the village has a southern instead of a western exposure, and its delightful climate must be explained otherwise than as Tacitus affirms.

These will serve as samples of a certain sort of the curiosities of geography that abound in classical authors. In attempting to account for these, I shall incidentally be pointing out the principles on which many other statements like them may become more explicable.

The catalogue of ancient writers who devoted their especial energy to the advancement of geographical knowledge is long and honorable. The names of the more important men are well known and frequently cited. Hecataeus, writing in the sixth century before Christ, may be regarded as the first of the list. Then follow Herodotus and Hanno (fifth century), Ephorus, Megasthenes, Pytheas, and Dicaearchus (fourth century), Timaeus and Eratosthenes (third century), Hipparchus and Polybius (second century), Artemidorus (second-first century), Posidonius (first century before Christ), Strabo (first century after Christ), Pomponius Mela (writing under Claudius), Marinus Tyrius (second century); and the list culminates in Claudius Ptolemy (middle of the second century), whose great work on geography was the standard of the later ages down into the period of the Renaissance, unless perhaps in Byzantium, where Strabo retained his great popularity. The original works of many of these authors have disappeared, and our knowledge of them must be restored from extracts and references in the pages of their successors. Nowhere more than in this field, where later writers of necessity repeated in considerable measure, as we do at the present day, the statements of their predecessors, but added to and corrected them by the help of more recent material, is it of importance to analyze the work of each man, and to determine his sources and the extent and value of his independent contributions to the general fund of knowledge.

But in addition to this it is of especial moment, in my judgment, to recognize that in the course of time a sort of geographic tradition naturally tends to establish itself, and to exercise a powerful though not strictly defined influence upon each successive geographer, as well as upon popular ideas. No one man can be

expected to verify the entire data and conclusions of his predecessors in the field. His own new material will prompt and enable him to modify or elaborate this or that division of earlier work, but not to construct altogether a new world. The geographic tradition is forever present with its conservatizing pressure, acting as a brake on revolutionary tendencies, holding back the unconscious mind of the investigator from pursuing to the final logical outcome even the indications that lie ready before him. We must expect to find in geographical statements, even after exploration and investigation are relatively far advanced, many incongruities and absurdities that appear, and are, quite out of harmony with the general equipment of the writer in whose works they exist.¹ They naturally attract our attention, but need not arouse our wonder: they are due to the persistence of the geographic tradition.

Another element of great importance, as it seems to me, in its influence on the geographic tradition has apparently not received the attention it deserves; I mean the use of maps by the ancients independently of geographical treatises. Unfortunately, the information on which we might depend for certain conclusions on the matter is extremely scanty. Anaximander (610-547 B.C.), the pupil and successor of Thales, introducer if not inventor of the *gnomon*, which remained for many centuries practically the geographer's sole instrument for determining terrestrial latitudes, is reputed to have been the first man to publish a plan of the earth's surface. A map of the world engraved on a plate of bronze was used at Sparta about 500 B.C. It was said by Herodotus (v. 49) to exhibit *γῆς ἀπάσης περίοδος καὶ θάλασσά τε πᾶσα καὶ ποταμοὶ πάντες*. This may have been a copy of Anaximander's map. Maps of the world were certainly not uncommon in the time of Herodotus (iv. 36: *ὅρεών γῆς περιόδους γράψαντας πολλοὺς ἤδη*), and the manner

¹ Meusel (*Jahresb. d. Philol. Ver.*, 1910) insists that Caesar, having been resident in Gaul for years, and having traversed it far in every direction, could not possibly have been guilty of such false orientation as that in *B.G.* i. 1. 5-7. The point appears to me not well taken. Other writers blundered even worse than this about topographical matter upon which it might be reasonably certain that they were well informed; and it is precisely such problems of general orientation of larger regions that are the most readily subject to error, in the lack of triangulation methods. Caesar was not wise above all other men. But there are sufficient other reasons for judging the passage in question to be an interpolation of much later date.

of his criticism of them indicates that in general they embodied an already established geographic tradition. A map was introduced on the stage in the *Clouds* of Aristophanes (vss. 206 ff.), not at all as a device strange to the audience, but as a well-known aid to instruction. A geographic tradition is clearly recognized by Eratosthenes, who distinctly set out to revise the map of the world (Strab. ii. 1. 2, C 68: *οἱεται δεῖν διωρθῶσαι τὸν ἀρχαῖον γεωγραφικὸν πίνακα*). In the later time of the Roman republic, and throughout the imperial period and world, maps were such commonplace affairs that citation of authorities is unnecessary. They were used in instruction, they were held in private possession, they were displayed in public buildings.

Ptolemy had a series of maps prepared to accompany his work on geography, and it is held by some that his treatise ought rather to be regarded as a commentary on his maps than his maps mere illustrations of his treatise. It is possible—perhaps probable—that the maps preserved to the present day in company with the text of Ptolemy are in unbroken descent from those he himself mentions; but if they are so, they are the only maps of any one of the geographers I have enumerated to come down to us. The maps of the world according to Hecataeus, Herodotus, and the rest are modern restorations constructed from the treatises of the writers concerned, when these are extant, or, in the case of geographers whose works have vanished, from extracts and references preserved in later writers. The maps are true, then, only to a somewhat limited degree, varying according to the fulness of our information.

But that the ordinary source of geographical knowledge in ancient days was such maps, and not the learned treatises of specialists, would certainly appear most likely. Indeed, in some instances it would look as if even the specialist used his predecessor's map as the basis for his own study, and turned to the wearisome treatise for statistics only when he could hardly avoid it. And it should be observed that the popularization of geographical maps independently of the learned treatises must have been a very decided influence in the conserving of the geographic tradition. Few men would think of revising the maps in their possession in view of the reports from a recent campaign or the stories of a

returned trader or explorer. (Few of us, I dare say, have entered in our own most-used atlas the "River of Doubt.") Thus "old editions" would continue to be in use, old ideas would still be handed on, and such new facts as might force themselves upon the attention would merely be fitted into the old scheme in any ready offhand manner. And doubtless in ancient as in modern days many persons, otherwise intelligent, found it impossible to gain a true topographic knowledge from either book or map, and had to fall back on oral questioning of the better informed, chiefly about itinerary distances, the course of rivers, and the like, and upon autopsy. There has been, I fear, too great a tendency to treat the incidental chapters or statements on geography in a historian, for example, as if they must be due to the following of this or that special authority, whereas they may have been dependent merely upon the current geographic tradition, or upon some current map. The latter, of course, like the former, must ultimately date back to some more authentic source, but may have departed unwittingly quite a distance from it. We surely need not be "wiser than the ancients."

As regards latitudes, it may be remarked that they could be computed with some degree of exactness at places where a competent observer equipped with a *gnomon* was present, but the determination of longitudes by observational methods was unknown. Chief reliance had to be placed on reports of itinerary distances of one place from another, and these were most assiduously collected. When such material became abundant, a rude sort of triangulation from point to point must have been possible; but the mischief was that the reports of distances between given places differed to a marvelous degree. Of this disagreement many instances are recorded. In general the geographic tradition made "the inhabited earth" much more narrow from north to south than it really was in proportion to its alleged and plotted extension from east to west.¹ I have even imagined that the persistence of this tradition of a great east-west elongation of the map had some influence upon the

¹ Of course the terms "latitude" and "longitude" retain in our day the sole remaining trace of this concept. The influence on Columbus of the ancient exaggeration of the eastern longitude of India will be remembered.

curious construction of the archetype of the Peutinger Table, which plots the roads and stations of the Roman Empire within the encircling ocean on a broad horizontal ribbon more than twenty times as long as it is wide.

But however this may be, the result of the ancient tradition of very excessive relative elongation of the map from east to west upon the depiction of the western part of Europe (with which alone I am now concerned) is readily evident. The coast line of Germany-Gaul-Spain, which I have said above (pp. 89 f.) appears to have been early considered to be substantially a straight line,¹ was drawn into a much more east-west prolongation than the reality justifies, and Spain was thrust out much farther westward than it actually lies. That tends to give to the parallel coasts of Britain to the north and Gaul-Spain-Germany to the south the east-west orientation they hold in certain of the writers that I have cited above (p. 92). The method of projection commonly employed (that later styled Mercator's) may have contributed to this configuration.

As regards the prodigious extension of the coast line of Britain opposite the continent, I am inclined to think that this is to be explained, not entirely as merely another example of the great exaggeration of distances in a little-known region (of which copious instances can be cited), but as due to an early confusion about the shape of the island, which left its trace thus in the report (and consequent plotting) of this dimension. The form seems to have been considered as long and narrow, coming to a point at the eastern and western extremities. The eastern end (Cantium), being nearest to the mainland, became known much earlier than the western. In some way in the reports of distances (which the geographers always collected with great avidity) the southern and western sides, I conceive, were added together, and understood to lie in substantially the same line. Britain, therefore, having its eastern extremity determined as opposite the mouth of the Rhine, must

¹ If Strabo had not disbelieved Pytheas, he might have saved himself from the perpetuation of this error: for Pytheas observed the deep recession of the Bay of Biscay, and the projection of Brittany. Polybius also thought Pytheas a manifest liar about his voyage to Britain. It is a great pity that the book which Polybius himself devoted to a description of the geography of Europe has not been preserved.

be plotted as stretching far out opposite Spain; and the concept once formed persisted, even after the triangular shape of the island (which Pytheas reported from his own voyage of exploration) was established, and its position to the northwest of Gaul instead of the north determined. This misapprehension will also explain why Ireland is represented by some writers as lying between the south coast of Britain and Spain, while others, who had evidently learned something about the Cornwall end of the island, but were still not free from the earlier tradition of shape in other respects, place it to the north of Britain. That is, they were truly informed that Ireland lay opposite, not the south coast of Britain, but the adjacent side as one proceeds westward; but as they still clung to the concept of a long and narrow Britain stretching east-west, they naturally placed Ireland to the north of the larger island.¹ Even Eratosthenes, though he notes the Cantium end of the island as a sort of dividing projection, does not follow Pytheas as closely as he might well have done, but apparently regards the island as long and narrow. We are left in ignorance of what Pytheas and Eratosthenes thought about the position of Ireland.

But no ancient geographical treatise, and no map reconstructed from such a source, accounts directly for the statement about the course of the Rhone that I have quoted from Polybius (p. 91; I have already said that his own book on the geography of Europe is not extant). I therefore venture another explanation, following the idea that appears to me reasonable that maps rather than extensive special treatises were the source of many of the statements about geographical matters made by ancient writers who were not by profession geographers, and occasionally even by some who were. I have already indicated that Polybius thought of the Alps as crossing in a straight line from "the neighborhood of Marseilles" to the head of the Adriatic. If in addition to this the map that lay before Polybius were so orientated that the main axis of Italy was regarded as running north-south, his error about the direction of the Rhone's course would be satisfactorily accounted

¹ Ptolemy, with all his increased knowledge and more critical judgment, apparently had not freed himself entirely from this tradition, for he plants Ireland much too far north with respect to Britain.

for. Or if Polybius had before him such a map as I have reconstructed to illustrate this essay, his statement about the direction of the course of the Rhone might be regarded as conforming closely enough to its indications to make it unnecessary to suppose that he used a wrongly orientated map of Italy or of Europe. To be sure, his own travels in the region ought to have enabled him to correct even his map; but they evidently did not, and perhaps that is too much to expect of any ancient writer. I have known many very intelligent people nowadays who have not the slightest "topographic sense," even with a map and the landscape before their eyes.

But to turn to the Caesar passages: H. Meusel very properly pointed out (*Jahresb. d. Phil. Ver.*, 1910) that in *B.G.* i. 5-7, Caesar, writing for Romans, would naturally be expected to give the orientation of the main divisions of Gaul from the standpoint of Italy; but Meusel uses the objection only to assist in his destruction of faith in the authorship by Caesar of the passage in question: A. Klotz essays an explanation in his *Cäsarstudien* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1910). He calls up from the vasty deep of forgotten years the unsubstantial spirit of a certain Timagenes, materializes him into solid form, and makes him one of the chief sources of Strabo, whom he could not have preceded far in time. Now Strabo (and therefore Timagenes) clearly states that the Pyrenees run north and south, and describes Aquitania as bounded on the west by the Pyrenees, on the north by the ocean: therefore the pseudo-Caesar, whom Klotz believes to have followed Timagenes, says that Aquitania *spectat inter occasum solis et septentriones*. Similarly Celtica, which has as its main boundary the ocean on the north, *uergit ad septentriones*; and to the adjacent Belgica is left the northeast. This may be the right explanation; but there are various difficulties connected with it which I must not take space to discuss. I would merely suggest that if the pseudo-Caesar had a map before him orientated like the one that I have conjectured as a possible foundation for the error cited from Polybius—a map with the main axis of Italy lying in what was taken to be a north-south line—and especially if it showed the traditional flattening down toward the east-west lineal of the coast line of Germany-Gaul-

Spain, his statement of general direction would be accurate enough from the standpoint of central Italy, and no citation of *Timagenes* would be necessary in order to enable the reader to comprehend it. Or if he used such a map as the one I have sketched herewith to illustrate "the early geographic tradition," we might consider his statement of the relative direction of the three divisions of Gaul entirely justifiable, whether he was speaking from an assumed standpoint in Italy or in the Province.

With regard to the description of Britain in *B.G.* v. 13, I think it very evident that the pseudo-Caesar has jumbled together two discrepant accounts; the earlier, that represents Britain as long and narrow, extending east-west from the mouth of the Rhine to the Pyrenees, with Ireland lying between it and Spain, and the later and truer, that depicts Britain as a triangle, lying to the northwest of Gaul, with its nearer coast running somewhat northeast-southwest, so that its Cantium angle points east, and the Cornwall angle south. Here is another example of the persistence of an earlier geographic tradition that an unintelligent student attempts to combine with later discoveries, instead of rejecting the first absolutely. Whether so shrewd a scholar as Caesar could have been guilty of such an impossible mixture as this, I am inclined to doubt. It may be that here is another geographic argument for condemning the passage concerned as an interpolation.

Ptolemy has a curious error in his orientation of Scotland, quite out of harmony with the precision of his knowledge of the country in other respects. He joins it on to England at a decided angle, bending it far over to the eastward. Mr. Henry Bradley ("Ptolemy's Geography of the British Isles," *Archaeologia*, XVIII [1885]) accounted for this on the supposition that Ptolemy, or his predecessor, used a separate map of Scotland, and in combining it with the map of England on the general chart mistook the orientation by a quadrant. I imagine that a similar sort of error may account for the perversion by Tacitus of the orientation of the island of Capri (cf. p. 91). Whether he had himself ever set foot upon the island, or was depending on a sketch made for him on the authority of some other person, it is impossible to decide. Even if he had visited the place, it is not at all



Sketch-map of Western Europe to illustrate the early geographic tradition

inconceivable that he might later have erred concerning its position. Modern visitors are often inclined to think that Capri lies much more nearly north-south than is actually the case, and its true orientation is not readily discernible from all parts of the mainland. If his sketch were drawn, as was perfectly natural, with the longer axis of the island coincident with the longer axis of the tablet or sheet of paper on which it was depicted, he might easily later have taken the "top of the page" to be the north end, and have expressed himself accordingly. It must be remembered that the ancients, especially in the case of local maps of limited areas, had no such rigid rule of uniform and exact orientation as prevails in modern days (witness the varying orientation of mediæval maps of the city of Rome, and therefore presumably of their ancient prototypes: the ancient *Forma Vrbis Romae*—the "Marble Plan"—certainly did not have north at the top).

Of course it is conceivable that Tacitus used a map of Italy and the adjacent islands like that the possibility of which I have conjectured above (p. 97), and that the orientation of this, with other possible lack of accuracy in it, contributed to, or was even responsible for, his error.¹

¹ The accompanying sketch-map is not drawn according to the data supplied by any single ancient geographer. It is rather a sort of composite picture, and aims to represent in general outline the configuration of Western Europe somewhat as it must have been depicted in popular maps of the last two or three centuries before Christ, and perhaps even later. Numerous early known details, such as the course of the Apennines and Cevennes, of certain rivers, and the position of sundry islands and towns, are omitted because not directly illustrative of matters treated in the text of the essay.

THE PROSECUTION OF MURENA

By RICHARD WELLINGTON HUSBAND
Dartmouth College

L. Licinius Murena had been praetor in the year 65 B.C. In accordance with the legal requirement that there should be an interval of two years between the time of holding the praetorship and that of holding the consulship, he sought election in 63 for the chief magistracy of the following year. In addition to Murena, there were three candidates for the office, Servius Sulpicius Rufus, Decimus Junius Brutus, and Lucius Sergius Catilina. The story of this turbulent election is well known to all who are familiar with the history of Cicero's consulship. The election resulted in the choice of Murena and Silanus to be consuls for the next year. Immediately Catiline formed his plans definitely for armed rebellion, while Sulpicius in his disappointment turned to the law courts for satisfaction and instituted criminal proceedings against Murena for corrupt practices alleged to have occurred in his canvassing prior to the election.¹ The trial took place some time in November of that year, evidently a few days subsequent to the delivery of Cicero's second oration against Catiline. During the course of the trial of Murena, Cicero frequently alludes to the recent flight of Catiline from the city, but says that his lieutenants remained and might still cause much trouble to the state. Clearly this was spoken before the arrest and execution of the leaders of the conspiracy in Rome, an event which took place early in December of that year.

The plaintiff in the case against Murena, as already mentioned, was Sulpicius, who had three men as junior counsel, one of whom at least was famous. This was Marcus Porcius Cato, now tribune-elect, through whose vigorous argument, perhaps only two weeks after the trial of Murena, the penalty of death was inflicted upon the confederates of Catiline. A second assistant attorney for the

¹For the history of legislation upon corruption at elections see my article in *Classical Journal*, XI, 535 ff.

prosecution was Gaius Postumus, a knight, at this time a candidate for the praetorship. The least conspicuous member of the group was Servius Sulpicius Galba, a young man, probably a cousin of the plaintiff.

The case for the defendant was argued by three eminent patrons, two of them the acknowledged leaders of the bar at the time. The greatest of these three was Cicero, then consul, ably supported by Hortensius, Rome's most noted forensic orator with the exception of Cicero. The third was M. Licinius Crassus, who, like Hortensius, had already held the consulship. Crassus had now much political influence, and he was probably chosen by the defense more for this reason than because of his ability as a pleader, although he had also some reputation as a speaker. The praetor who presided in the case is unknown, for Cicero, contrary to his custom, does not once mention him in the whole course of his argument.

The charge made against Murena was that he had acted in violation of the terms of the Tullian law on bribery and corrupt practices, the measure proposed and carried by Cicero earlier in this same year. In particular, the following five matters were specified as justification for instituting action against Murena: first, that upon his return from his province, many persons went out to meet and welcome him as he entered Rome, and escorted him to his house; secondly, that a large escort followed him about while he was a candidate for the consulship; thirdly, that he exhibited spectacles free of charge to the people tribe by tribe; fourthly, that he invited crowds of the common people to dinners; fifthly, that he endeavored illegally to secure the votes of the centuries of the knights.

It is interesting to notice that both Sulpicius and Cato objected to Cicero's appearing in the case. The ground upon which Sulpicius based his objection was the purely sentimental one that he and Cicero had always been friends, and that it was contrary to the spirit of their friendship for Cicero to appear against him at this particular time. For some reason Cicero makes rather short work of this objection. But he seems to feel hurt by the attitude of Sulpicius, for he says that it is a serious matter to be accused by a friend in any situation, but that it is necessary to take notice of

it and make reply when one is attacked unjustly. He pays Sulpicius the high compliment of saying that, if friendship were to be regarded as the determining factor, no good advocate would appear against Sulpicius. He claims also that Sulpicius is guilty of the same attitude toward friendships, in that he gives advice in his civil law practice to those persons who are suing his own friends. Cicero furthermore points to his own friendship with Murena, and declares that he cannot leave his friend undefended when he is in trouble. And lastly, since the welfare of the state was involved in this case, he maintains that not even his active assistance of Sulpicius in the recent campaign could be of the slightest inducement to him to absent himself from the defense of Murena.

The argument made by Cato is more fundamental, and conducted along more logical lines, as one might expect from a man well versed in constitutional law, as well as from one whose whole life was ordered upon a reasonable basis. Cato raises two important issues. The first is that a consul should not appear in the case. We know of the argument only from the reply by Cicero, and that is unfortunate, for we should like to know in Cato's own words whether the point was that a public official should avoid practicing his profession while holding office. Cicero's reply is that it is reasonable for a consul to endeavor in any manner to prevent the state from falling into trouble in the future—and the exoneration of Murena was a case in point. If Rome had the habit, seen in some other states, of appointing a state attorney for the defense, it would be most appropriate that a consul should be appointed to defend a consul-elect. Cicero does not appeal to precedent in his own support, but it is worth noting that he had already, during his consulship, twice broken the principle which Cato apparently attempts to establish. First, he had defended Rabirius before the people in his famous trial for murder. If the principle was right, Cicero committed a more flagrant wrong in that case than in the case of Murena, for a special commission had been publicly appointed to try Rabirius, and yet Cicero appeared in his defense. And again, he was counsel for the defense in the case of Piso, who was prosecuted for malfeasance in office while governor of Gallia Narbonensis. It is probable that L. Crassus, in his consulship of

95 B.C., defended Caepio, charged with the same offense. Cicero had also, while praetor in 66, defended M. Fundanius, who was being prosecuted for some irregularity apparently while in office. In the same year he defended Cluentius on a charge of murder, and became counsel for C. Cornelius, who was to be tried for treason. This last case was not heard until the following year. And only six years earlier, Hortensius while praetor prosecuted P. Septimius Scaevola on the ground of extortion in the province of which he was governor. No doubt many other examples could be discovered, but these are sufficient to indicate that the nation accepted the principle of permitting public officials to engage in private enterprises while actually holding office. There is no record of an objection being raised in any of these instances.

But it is quite probable that Cato did not intend to imply that this was a broad principle of the constitution, or had become obligatory by custom. The reply of Cicero couples it closely with the second part of Cato's objection. This was that the proposer of any measure should not appear as counsel in a case arising under the provisions of that proposal, provided it were enacted into law. But legislation could formally originate only with the presiding officer of an assembly, and that meant only with an official of the state. So Cato's meaning comes to this, that an official of the state, who acted as presiding officer of an assembly, and formally proposed any measure, should thereafter be debarred from pleading in cases arising under that measure. But there are four cases recorded within the next ten years, in which Cicero appeared for defendants on this same charge, and two others in which he probably did so. It would perhaps be impossible to find another instance exactly like these, but there are some that could fairly be compared with them. For example, during the prosecution of Gabinius in 54 for extortion, Caesar sent a letter to Rome in behalf of Gabinius, although the trial arose according to the provisions of the law passed by Caesar himself only five years earlier. It is also known that Pompey interfered in trials of the year 52, especially in that of Q. Metellus Pius for corrupt practices, although he was the author of the law, regulating both the procedure and the penalties, by which Metellus was being tried. Undoubtedly it was by accident rather than by design

that no instances occurred where the authors of laws acted as counsel in cases arising under their own laws, or possibly it would be closer to the truth to say that no such instances are preserved to us. And yet it is easy to understand that the situation in the trial of Murena might seriously offend one so strict as Cato.

The order of speakers and events in the trial of Murena, according to the reasoning of Zumpt, was probably as follows:

I. In the first action: (1) opening speech by Servius Sulpicius, the chief prosecutor; (2) reply by Q. Hortensius; (3) the taking of evidence.

II. In the second action: (4) speech by C. Postumus; (5) speech by the younger Servius Sulpicius; (6) reply to these two by Crassus; (7) possibly the taking of further evidence; (8) speech by M. Cato; (9) reply by Cicero.

Cicero gives some account of the speeches of all four accusers, and says that the other two speakers for the defense preceded him. This necessitates placing Cicero last in the whole order of the trial, for as usual in criminal trials the defense followed the prosecution in summing up its case just prior to the voting by the jury. Nor is it probable that evidence was offered after Cicero had finished speaking, otherwise he would have referred to the fact that evidence would yet be given. If further proof that Cicero was the closing speaker is needed, we have it in the fact that he does not mention a single witness, nor does he definitely refer to the evidence that had been offered. He assumes that the facts in the case and the law are already known to the jury, and takes upon himself the function of putting together all the arguments, and reviewing the course of the debate among the six who had preceded him.

It would be natural to assume that the opening speech for the prosecution was made by the chief accuser, in accordance with Roman habit, but the only direct evidence for this assumption is the nature of the speech delivered by Sulpicius. Cicero's review of the speech, and of the reply by Hortensius, renders it obvious that Sulpicius opened the case for the prosecution, and that he was followed immediately by Hortensius. Since it was the custom to call witnesses as soon as the opening speeches had been delivered, we are justified in placing the taking of evidence in the third place.

Two facts lead us to place the speech of Cato immediately before that of Cicero. In the first place, it would be very unusual for two speeches to be given by the defense after all the argument for the prosecution had been finished, although provision was made for such a situation in the case of Milo. And, in the second place, Cicero replies at such length to the arguments of Cato that we cannot suppose that a reply had already been made by either Hortensius or Crassus. We are compelled, therefore, to place the two speeches of the minor counsel for the prosecution at the beginning of the second action, and to assume that the speech of Crassus followed and answered them. The only really doubtful part of the system is whether the trial should be divided into two actions. The case of Verres indicates, apart from other evidence, that this division occurred regularly in cases of extortion, but it cannot be proved that it extended to the other criminal courts. But that is a slight matter, and means merely that proof does not exist that an adjournment took place in the middle of the trial, although that would not affect a decision as to the order of events throughout the hearing of the case.

Cicero says that the attack upon Murena by counsel for the prosecution fell into three divisions: First, they attacked Murena's mode of life. Secondly, they reviewed the history of the contest between Murena and Sulpicius for the various offices. Thirdly, they showed what evidence existed that Murena was guilty of corrupt practices during the recent campaign. If we may judge by the words of Cicero in the concluding speech of the trial, the chief prosecutor, Sulpicius, spoke upon the first and second of these topics; Postumus and Sulpicius Galba spoke upon the third; while Cato, closing the case for the prosecution, reviewed all three points.

On the first of these points Sulpicius argued that Murena had spent much of his early life abroad in the wars, but without distinguishing himself; that he had merely endeavored to shine by reflected glory from the triumph which his father had gained through his victories in Asia; that this long absence from Rome had prevented him from gaining the acquaintance that was so important to one striving for political favor, unless his military achievements were sufficiently great to win him votes from those

not personally acquainted with him. On the second topic, Sulpicius reviewed the whole public career of Murena and of himself, in the effort to make it appear unreasonable to suppose that the electors would have voted for Murena rather than for him, unless some undue influence were exerted for the purpose of winning their votes. First of all, Murena was of a plebeian family, and from Lanuvium, while Sulpicius was a patrician, and always known in Rome. Sulpicius expressed his contempt for the family of Murena, and extolled his own. In the second place, while Murena had been so constantly absent from Rome in the field, conducting his minor military enterprises as lieutenant to Lucullus, and was neither gaining an acquaintance in Rome nor deriving fame as a soldier, Sulpicius was in Rome engaged in the practice of the law. He had always been before the eyes of the people, and had conducted an open canvass for the various offices. The result was that in the election for the quaestorship in 74 B.C., and in that for the praetorship in 65 B.C., for which offices the two men were candidates together, Sulpicius had been the first to receive the number of votes requisite for election. This showed the greater popularity of Sulpicius. For all these reasons, he argues, it is quite certain that the people would have chosen him in preference to Murena in this last election also, unless Murena had used some improper means to gain their votes.

We know very little about the speeches of Postumus and Sulpicius Galba, for they dealt with some of the technical proofs that Murena had been guilty of bribery, and the younger Pliny says that when Cicero revised his speech for publication he omitted some of the parts of the speech as he had delivered it. This seems to be confirmed by the fact that the manuscripts give only the heading of the sections which had been devoted to Cicero's reply to these two men. In other parts of the speech where the two junior counsel are mentioned the subjects of their speeches are given by Cicero so briefly that it is impossible to understand their significance thoroughly.

Cicero mentions in a very few words two topics in the speech of Postumus, but so briefly that even an accurate translation is impossible. The first topic may mean that Postumus discussed

"the evidence offered by Murena's agents," that is, by the agents employed by Murena for the distribution of money to his supporters. This would imply that the agents had been summoned by the prosecution to give evidence against Murena. Of course these men could be prosecuted for the same offense, through the enactment of the Calpurnian law four years earlier, but that law had created an exception, that one who turned state's evidence and thereby secured the conviction of his principal would himself receive immunity. But it seems incredible that this took place, for it is hard to see how Murena could have escaped conviction if his agents had divulged anything of importance. And it may further be held that such revelations as they might make would be such interesting reading that Cicero would certainly include them in his published speech. This situation would offer a chance for his highest skill as a pleader, and he would not have allowed it to pass unpublished. We must, therefore, reject this meaning of the text. The alternative translation of the passage is, "the evidence given against Murena's agents," that is, evidence was offered to show that Murena employed agents. This seems to be the better meaning to assign to the words, and, if the evidence was not conclusive, there would be adequate reason for its omission in the published oration. Postumus also spoke about the discovery of certain moneys. Here again we are left with only those words, and their meaning cannot be ascertained with certainty. But the chances are that the right of searching houses, vested in Roman officials, is implied, and that the right had been used of searching the houses of Murena and his alleged agents, and that money was found in them. The amount was great enough to cause the suspicion to become stronger that money was being used for illegal purposes. This reminds one of the search a few days later, conducted at the house of Cethegus, resulting in the discovery of a store of arms, and thus confirming the belief that the conspiracy of Catiline was soon to be launched. Servius Sulpicius Galba spoke on the subject of the centuries of the knights. It was scarcely to be expected that these centuries would vote for the plebeian Murena in preference to voting for the patrician Sulpicius, and the fact that they did so aroused suspicion of some unfair influence. One who

was engaged in offering bribes would naturally try to secure these votes, for the knights voted early in the course of the election, and their vote always had considerable effect upon the centuries that voted later.

Cato had something to say on all three parts of the accusation against Murena, but he seems to have devoted himself particularly to the immediate question of bribery. So far as relates to the private life of Murena, there is but one statement attributed to Cato, one that sounds strange to modern ears, namely, that Murena was a dancer. To understand this, it is necessary to remember that Cato refers to individual dancing for the entertainment of a group, and that it was considered disgraceful, and fit to be indulged in only by a hired actor. Cicero regards this as a serious charge, and says that a citizen who would engage in dancing is one who would be guilty of any kind of wicked and immoral conduct. And this seems to have been the feeling of the Romans generally. Thus Nepos says that dancing was considered to be a disgraceful action among the Romans, although in the eyes of the Greeks it was pleasing and worthy of approval. Cicero himself makes the same accusation against a consul a few years later, and classes the act among those that are unworthy of a freeman, or of one who is sober. "Who in those days," he says, "ever saw you sober, or doing anything worthy of a freeman, when the house of your colleague resounded with song and cymbals, and he himself danced naked at a banquet?" The only forms of dancing that were recognized as reputable were the military dance and that which took place in religious ceremonies. In connection with the services of Murena to the state, in comparison with those of Sulpicius, Cato holds that the war against Mithridates was a war against little women, and therefore the exploits of Murena were not of sufficient consequence to win him the favor of the voters in Rome. It is rather distinctly implied in the words of Cicero that Cato declared that all wars conducted against Greeks and Asiatics were trifling and insignificant.

When Cato came to the subject immediately under discussion, namely, the crime of which Murena was accused, he divided that portion of his speech into three parts: First, he gave the reasons for his own participation in the accusation. Secondly, he spoke on

the topic of the recent debates in the senate on the question of bribery, and showed that the matters charged against Murena were the very points on which the senate had expressed its opinion. Thirdly, he treated of the necessity for preserving the state from the injuries inflicted by corrupt officials and corrupt candidates.

He felt strongly that men should be elected to office solely on the ground of merit, and that it was degrading to seek favor by free exhibitions of spectacles, or to appeal to men's appetites in order to gain their votes. Consequently he thought it his duty to protest against the excessive canvassing of Murena, and by means of this protest to endeavor to counteract the modern tendency to substitute personal persuasiveness, or personal influence, for genuine worth. These were his motives in assisting in the present prosecution. Then he dealt particularly with the definite evidence against Murena in connection with his mode of conducting his campaign. He pointed to the large number of followers who constantly attended Murena during this time. He told of the free spectacles offered to the people, and of the dinners to which Murena invited many citizens. All of these things were contrary to the resolution of the senate, passed upon motion of Lucius Caesar in the year 64, and contrary to the resolution of the senate in this very year, a resolution moved by Cicero the consul, but initiated, as everybody knew, by Sulpicius. The frequency with which the senate discussed the question of bribery and other corrupt practices showed that it was serious about the purification of politics; and in the midst of this discussion Murena was putting into practice all the acts of which the senate complained.

Cicero, in the final speech of the trial, makes reply to all four speeches of the prosecution. But it must be admitted that he treats in a most summary and unsatisfactory fashion several of the largest topics of the case. But Cicero has given what is probably to be regarded as a sufficient explanation of his omissions. "Quintus Hortensius has said many very severe things, and therefore my task now is the more difficult; for, after he had spoken before me, as well as Marcus Crassus, a man of the greatest dignity, and industry, and effectiveness as a speaker, I was to speak at the end, and not to plead on any special part of the accusation, but to deal with the

whole subject as I might think advisable." And again, referring to the specific charge of bribery, Cicero says: "The charge has been entirely refuted by those who have preceded me, but I must still discuss it, for that is the wish of Murena." Evidently he was given the task that was often assigned to him of handling in the most effective way the points that had already been the topic of argument by counsel, in order that his great skill in working upon the emotions of his hearers might dispose the minds of the jury in favor of his client just before they were to vote upon the issue.

On the first point made by the prosecuting attorneys, that the early life of Murena was not of a kind to bring him into the notice of the citizens, and that he was in some degree corrupt, Cicero is dealing with a topic to which he is partial. He insists that this should be the most important of all the issues raised by the prosecution, but that they had treated it in a very trifling way. During his career at the bar, Cicero several times expressed his belief that the most satisfactory answer to a criminal accusation consisted in proving that the life of the accused, up to the time when he fell under suspicion, had always been above reproach. This is notably the case in his reply to the charge that Publius Cornelius Sulla was concerned in the conspiracy of Catiline. In reply to the charge of Sulpicius that Murena had spent his early years in Asia, and that he had accomplished nothing whatsoever, but had merely participated in the spectacle of his father's triumph, Cicero characterizes the whole charge as false. He had been of very active assistance to his father, and had assumed his full share of the responsibility. He had, indeed, been present in the triumph of his father, but no objection should be raised to that, when many mere boys had often been seen in the triumphal processions of their fathers. After his quaestorship, Murena returned to Asia to serve under Lucullus, and there his commander-in-chief often placed him in charge of forces to perform some special duty. The official dispatches of Lucullus proved that he accomplished these most satisfactorily. At the same time, his private life in Asia was one of the greatest moderation. Asia was a province exposing one to all manner of temptation, and it was much to the credit of Murena that he held himself aloof from every excess. The accusation of Cato, that

Murena was a dancer, was, therefore, absurd, and but an abusive expression, for such a thing is found only as the accompaniment of drunken revels and of lewdness. These things were not alleged against Murena, and therefore the charge of dancing must be seen to be unfounded.

When Cicero reached the discussion of the qualifications of the two men for office, he first attacked vigorously the position of Sulpicius, who claimed that it was unreasonable to suppose that a man of plebeian origin should be preferred to himself. Cicero grows impatient of such comparisons, saying that this kind of arrogance had once led to the secession of the plebs, and might again lead to incalculable injury to the state. And yet he derives considerable satisfaction from the successful effort he makes to turn the tables on Sulpicius on the very point of his attack. It is true, he admits, that Murena is of plebeian origin, but his great-grandfather and his grandfather had both been praetors, and his father had been praetor, and had won a triumph in addition. In the meanwhile, what had the family of Sulpicius been doing? They had once been famous, but for two generations had done nothing of any consequence whatever in the state. Cicero was therefore accustomed to place the present Sulpicius in the class of new men, along with Murena and Cicero himself, for Sulpicius was rising from obscurity just as they were. Then he gives Sulpicius another delightful blow, this time on the ground of tact; for he says that he did not expect that Sulpicius would be so ungracious as to advance an argument on the subject of birth in a case where a consul, a new man, was defending a consul-elect, also a new man.

Sulpicius claimed that the forum was the only place that qualified for office, and that Murena had been absent from Rome for many years, and had not adopted the kind of life that would fit him for office, or make him personally known to the electors. Cicero meets this by declaring emphatically his belief that military renown is of greater aid in reaching the consulship than is a knowledge of the civil law. In fact, the civil law is the least likely of all the public professions to win the sympathy and approval of the voters. The soldier gains the favor of the people most quickly, and next to him stands the orator. But the civil law has too many

transparent absurdities to give a man a reputation. "As soon as the suspicion of disturbance has made itself heard, instantly our arts become silent." Cicero here indulges in good-natured raillery directed against the profession of Sulpicius. He ridicules the complicated and meaningless procedure in civil cases; he jeers at the foolish phraseology of the civilian; and he charges that the letter of the law has become far more important than justice. Nor is there very much learning in that profession: "If you arouse my anger, busy though I am, I will undertake to become a lawyer in three days." It is worth noting that Cicero rarely appeared in civil cases, and that he regarded his participation in criminal cases as a part of the function of the orator rather than of the lawyer.

But Sulpicius said that he and Murena had been opponents for the offices of the quaestorship and the praetorship, and in both instances his name had been announced first, since he was the first to secure the number of votes requisite for election. And so it was incredible that there should be such a change when the election to the consulship arrived. Cicero makes the very interesting reply that no attention should be paid to the order of election, for a choice by the people is too much a matter of chance or whim to be regarded as indicating permanent favor or popularity. "A single day, or a single night, may intervene, and everything is thrown into confusion. Sometimes the slightest breath of rumor changes the whole opinion of the voters. Often without any apparent cause things happen quite contrary to your expectation, so that the people themselves wonder what has taken place, as if they were not responsible for it." Furthermore, Murena had two special advantages in his canvass for the consulship. It was rumored that he would give magnificent games for the people; he had never been aedile, and so had lost this opportunity for drawing attention to himself earlier. And in the second place, many soldiers of Lucullus were now in Rome, and they voted for Murena, and were telling others of his good qualities. It was not surprising, therefore, that Murena was elected in preference to Sulpicius.

Cicero then reviews the history of the two men during the period of their holding the minor offices. The quaestorship gave neither of them an opportunity to extend his influence, or to add to his popu-

larity. When the duties of the quaestors were assigned by lot, Murena was given a task that could be conducted in a quiet and orderly fashion, whereas "you were assigned duties at Ostia, the very name of which is received with grumbling, for the work is laborious and disagreeable, and confers no popularity nor distinction." But it was in the year 65, the time of the praetorship of the two men, that an occasion arose for a change in the feelings of the people. Murena had been city praetor, a position which gives an opportunity for making many friends; Sulpicius had been in charge of the court of peculation, which always makes enemies. Immediately after their praetorship, Murena went to a province, and gained a reputation in Umbria and Gaul. Sulpicius had refused a province. Nothing could be said against the decision of Sulpicius to avoid being absent from Rome, for Cicero had himself refused provinces, both after his praetorship and now when he was consul, but it was one opportunity for gaining favor, and Sulpicius had neglected it.

Coming next to the time immediately prior to the consular election, Cicero shows that the conduct of the two men differed fundamentally. Murena devoted himself exclusively to the task of winning votes, while Sulpicius spent too much time watching the actions of Murena, and threatening him with prosecutions because of infringement of the laws on corrupt practices. This attitude quickly brings unpopularity, for the electors realize that a candidate conducts himself in this way only when he knows himself to be defeated. There is no advantage in voting for a candidate who already admits defeat. It was also very recently that Sulpicius had proposed a new law on the subject of bribery. The terms of this law were exceedingly severe, and caused Sulpicius the loss of such popularity as he had enjoyed before. As a result of these two things, the people perceived that Sulpicius could not be elected, and, becoming alarmed lest Catiline should gain the consulship, gave their votes most decidedly for Murena.

Cicero here brings his reply to Sulpicius to an end, and devotes much of the remainder of his speech to Cato. He first warns the jury not to be influenced against Murena by the nobility of character and the fine reputation possessed by his accuser, nor by the high expectation of his tribuneship. At the same time he warns Cato

not to expect a victory because of his character and reputation, for even Africanus once, when at the height of his popularity, had failed in his prosecution of Cotta. But Cicero does not mention the persistent rumor that Cotta had succeeded by the use of technicalities in having his trial seven times postponed, and had finally escaped by lavish bribery of the jury. Then Cicero expresses his feeling about the influence of the personality of the pleader: "I don't like an accuser to bring into a criminal court his personal power, or unusual influence, or eminent authority, or great popularity."

It was Cato who enumerated the definite acts with which Murena was charged. He had said that these things were contrary to the terms of the Tullian law, and contrary to the conviction of the senate expressed earlier in this year during the debate on the proposal of Sulpicius, and expressed also in the debate of the year before on the proposal of Lucius Caesar. But Cicero points out that it was illegal for a crowd to meet a returning candidate and accompany him through the streets, only if the crowd was bribed for that purpose; it was illegal to have an escort while a man was candidate for office, if he hired his escort to attend him. Neither of these things could be proved against Murena. It was admitted by the defense that Murena had presented many persons with seats for the public spectacles, but the Tullian law declared this illegal only if a whole tribe, or all the tribes, were granted free spectacles. Cato declared that it was a disgrace and a national calamity to be obliged to appeal for men's votes through their feelings or appetites. But Cicero replies that this had always been the Roman custom, and yet the Roman state was in better condition than were those states in which such things were forbidden, as illustrated by the condition of Crete and Sparta. To the reader of the speech Cicero's discussion of this topic seems like the merest quibbling. If his own law really forbade treating of tribes, or giving them free exhibitions, it must certainly have been the intent of the law to abolish these abuses when conducted on a large scale, and Cicero's contention that Murena did not treat the whole tribe seems to mean only that some members of the tribe were absent. And yet Cicero seizes upon

this technical avoidance of the letter of the law, and breaks down the spirit which was the basis of its enactment.

He then makes a good-natured attack upon Cato, somewhat similar to his attack upon Sulpicius. It was not intended to be taken very seriously, and evidently Cato enjoyed it as much as Cicero did, for Plutarch says that when Cicero sat down, Cato turned with a smile to those who were near him, and remarked: "Gentlemen, what a witty consul we have!" Cicero rallied him on his high moral tone, and told him that he did not live up to his own profession of goodness. From several phrases used by Cicero, it seems clear that all of this was intended to influence the jury to take a more lenient attitude toward Murena. He shows that even the punctilious Cato had sought the assistance of his friends in the campaign just ended, thereby casting aside his doctrine that political preferment should depend absolutely upon merit. He had also descended to having a man accompany him during his canvassing, who would tell him the names of voters as he met them on the street. Then Cato could address them by name and shake their hand. But Cicero contends that this involves a form of deceit which placed even Cato on the level of ordinary men.

The final section of the speech contains a strong appeal to the jury to acquit Murena in the interest of the state. Cicero says that if Cato joined the prosecution for the sake of cleaner politics, so did he himself undertake the defense out of regard for the immediate future of the country. In the present condition of the conspiracy of Catiline it was essential that there be a strong successor to Cicero in the consulship. There was but one month of the year remaining, and it was impossible to hold a new election within that short time. The result of the conviction of Murena would be that the state would enter upon the next year, a critical year, without a colleague for Silanus in the consulship. It was essential also for the success of the tribuneship of Cato that Silanus be not left as sole consul, for already the opposition of Metellus to Cato was manifest. The party of Metellus sought to destroy Cato, and they could accomplish their purpose unless there were two consuls to support him.

A more direct appeal to the jury is found in the warning that they must not decide the case as Catiline would wish it to be decided. The jury would find that they would be in personal danger, if there were but one consul for the following year, and if the war against Catiline could not be ended during the present year. In that case, the one consul would be obliged to devote himself to the election of a colleague, and could not give attention to the war against Catiline. The last appeal is on the ground of pity. Murena was sick, and the disgrace of the loss of the consulship, together with the disgrace of exile, should not come to him. The jury should remember that Murena was the first to bring the honor of the consulship to an old and respected family, and to an ancient principality.

It is well known that Murena was acquitted, and assumed office on the first of the following January. It is to be noticed that he was then well enough to undertake the duties of the consulship, in spite of the fact that he was so ill at the time of his trial a month earlier. And it is further noteworthy that there is no evidence that he was called upon to take the field against the forces of Catiline. The appeals to the jury for mercy, however, need not be taken as indicating a weak case, for that was but a habit of Cicero, recognized by his contemporaries as well as by modern students of Cicero. Whether the jury was convinced of the innocence of Murena, or whether they were influenced by the necessity for having a consul of tried military experience to assume office in the turmoil of the year, cannot be ascertained, owing to the insufficiency of the records of the case.

THE SOURCES OF THE *ODYSSEY*

By JOHN A. SCOTT
Northwestern University

Those who hold that the *Odyssey* is a traditional poem may roughly be divided into two classes: first, those who believe that the poem slowly developed under the guiding hand of succeeding generations, each generation refining, enlarging, or expurgating the poetry inherited from remote antiquity. This class is made up of Professor Gilbert Murray and his disciples, notably, J. A. K. Thompson who has recently set forth their views in a book, *Studies in the Odyssey*.¹ The second class consists of those who believe that there was a wide range of traditions connected with Troy, that a great mass of these became associated with Odysseus and his return, and that the poet of the *Odyssey* gave the poetic expression to these traditions; also that while the poet had high poetic gifts he confined himself mainly to songs and themes already known, and that the audience was already familiar with the essential outlines of the poet's songs, or, as Finsler expresses it, "The epic is the expression of the heroic saga, and that saga is not the result of poetic fancy."² Most Homeric scholars would indorse this second view, namely, the epic is the poetic expression of existing traditions.

In the opinion of the Murray school the *Odyssey* is a traditional and an expurgated poem, but these ideas are mutually exclusive. A poem cannot at the same time be both traditional and expurgated. Thompson's views as given in his book are as follows: p. 11, "Homer has no trace of the jealousy of the gods³ which is something like a dogma for the rest of Greek literature, yet Herodotus and the Attic tragedians are no less conscious than Homer of the limitations of humanity, and they believe in the divine jealousy." From this he

¹ Reviewed by me in *Classical Philology* for January, 1915. Some of the sentences then used are here repeated.

² Finsler, *Homer*, p. 33.

³ A mistake, as I have shown in *Classical Journal*, X, 271.

concludes that the belief in divine jealousy has been expurgated from Homer. That is, the *Odyssey* in this regard attains an elevation unapproached by the rest of the Greek world, and therefore these lower ideas have been expurgated. Again in arguing that the *Odyssey* is a traditional poem, p. 190: "It was the audience rather than the bard that chose the subject and the treatment, indeed the bard was more dependent upon his hearers than they were upon him, he had no other public, no appeal to a different tribunal or to posterity. Therefore the poet's matter was given him." The poet thus simply voiced the beliefs of his audience, but his audience which gave him his theme and his matter believed in the envy of the gods; then why did he expurgate it from tradition, a tradition with which that audience was already familiar and in which that audience believed? A sovereign genius might so overtop the mass as to doubt an accepted belief and ignore it in his poetry, but a mere purveyor of tradition could only echo the belief of his hearers; but they believed in the envy of the gods, hence the *Odyssey* cannot be at the same time an expurgated and a traditional poem.

Dr. Leaf in his *Homer and History*, p. 310, gives a most satisfying explanation for the absence from Homer of many of the most repulsive sides of Greek life:

It is free from many of the lower and coarser elements which are abundant in later Greek poetry, and which are in truth a direct inheritance from early stages of thought. But it is not the Epos itself which has been expurgated, but the society itself which gave rise to the Epos. The Achaian nobility had cast off much of the ancient dross when they entered Greece; in the courts of Mycenae they learned "good manners" and the ways of courts; they learned to avoid things which are not mentioned in the best society. Greek poetry arose in courts, in the atmosphere of a small and refined aristocracy; the lower elements were introduced at a later stage, and appealed to a mixed audience.

Murray and Thompson take it for an axiom that the heroes of Homer were originally gods, since in later times they were honored with shrines and offerings. We know that Alexander of Macedon was a man who later received divine honors, and we know that the Roman emperors were men who were later deified, and so with the saints and the apostles. The fact that there are shrines and temples named in honor of St. Paul does not prove that he was in origin a god. The fact that we have such convincing

evidence of divine honors paid to historical men warrants the assumption that a similar thing took place in an earlier age. How flat the promise of Calypso to make Odysseus immortal, if the hearers of the poem had already known him as a god! Then too Achilles was not prevented by his assumed divinity from dying ingloriously and being most miserable in Hades. How out of place in the mouth of a god were Achilles' bitter words, "Speak not to me of death, O illustrious Odysseus." Dr. Leaf has attacked vigorously the whole theory of the "faded god" in his first chapter of *Homer and History*.

The second view, namely, that the *Odyssey* is the poetic expression of existing traditions, is more reasonable, but it is not the truth. There are two traits inherent in tradition and traditional literature: a love for tracing lines of genealogies and the repetition of the same idea from various points of view. The Old Testament and Hesiod's *Theogony* are clearly intended to tell the traditions of the fathers and the inherited beliefs, and so accordingly there are the same repetitions, the same love for genealogies in both. There are in the Books of Samuel two accounts of the establishment of the Kingdom; two accounts of the origin of the proverb "Is Saul also among the prophets?"; two accounts of the flight of David into Philistia, and other similar repetitions. Hesiod twice tells of the birth of the Muses, once while tracing their origin on the side of the father, and once while tracing their origin on the side of their mother. The story of Pandora is told when he is telling of the duplicity of Prometheus and again when he is picturing the misfortunes of humanity.

This trait of repetition, so marked in such traditional works as the Old Testament and Hesiod, separates them at once from Homer, since not a single event described in the *Odyssey* is repeated, except under dramatic compulsion, and nothing narrated in the *Iliad* has any place in the later poem.

The second test of tradition is the preservation of genealogies, for genealogies are the particular mark of family or race pride. How all peoples love to call the roll of their ancestors!

The Old Testament abounds with them, and Hesiod's *Theogony* is largely made up of proper names. Prominent as Penelope is in

the story of the *Odyssey*, the name of her mother is not given and it is only by an accident that we learn the name of her father. Indeed the origin of Penelope is so indistinct in Homer that Aristotle in his *Poetics*, chap. xxv, is in doubt as to the name and home of her father. It is a mere accident which tells us the name of the mother of Odysseus and that he is not an only child. The *Odyssey* never suggests who is the mother of Helen, and it is only a chance remark which tells us that she is the daughter of Zeus, since the facts of her birth are passed over in silence. The practical ignoring of genealogies marks the *Odyssey* as something other than traditional poetry.

In this paper I hope to show that the *Odyssey* is not a traditional poem, but a new creation, and that while it assumes the events of the Trojan War as its background, the plot of the *Odyssey* never existed until conceived in the mind of Homer. The poem as a whole and in its detailed treatment is a new and original creation.

The poet of the *Odyssey* carefully avoids telling, not only all matters already known from the *Iliad*, but also all matters known from tradition as well. Other heroes came home from Troy, but where are the traditions on a large scale of the return of Diomede, of Idomeneus, and even of Menelaus? What a chance for a poet to have taken the return of Menelaus and Helen for his theme! They traveled nearly as many years as Odysseus, they visited Cyprus, Sidon, the Erembi, Aethiopia, Libya, and Egypt, they too left at home a disordered kingdom, and, what was far better suited for a poet's purpose, they left at home a beautiful daughter. What was Helen's daughter doing all these years—Helen's daughter without a guardian or a chaperon? What took place in Sparta when both king and queen were gone? Why did tradition so crowd the halls of Penelope, the mother of a grown son, with ardent wooers and desert the young and beautiful Hermione?

The wanderings of Helen and Menelaus were not suited to the poet's plans as unfolded in the *Odyssey*, since a wife, however charming, would have proved an impossible companion in the fairy-land to which the poet's fancy transported the hero.

How carefully he refuses to repeat the familiar traditions! Helen appears in the *Odyssey*, but we have no inkling of the fate

of her former paramours. What has become of Paris? What was her subsequent fate at Troy? We assume that Paris is dead and that Helen later transferred her affections to Deiphobus, of which there are but two slight indications: Menelaus (iv. 276) tells how Helen followed by Deiphobus came to see the wooden horse, and the bard (viii. 517) describes how after the destruction of the city Menelaus went straight for the dwelling of Deiphobus. These two faint references show that there must have been some tradition which related Helen and Deiphobus, and they show, in this case at least, that Homer avoided repeating a known tradition.

We are told (iv. 502): "Ajax son of Oileus might have escaped from the sea, even though he was hateful to Athena." The poet gives no inkling of the means by which Ajax had become hateful to Athena, but it must have been known from tradition, and hence was not repeated. Nestor and his family mourn the loss of Antilochus, yet there is no mention of the circumstances of his death; it is simply said that he was slain by an unnamed son of the Dawn. How did Ajax son of Telamon die? What was the end of Clytemnestra? These and scores of important events are assumed as known from tradition, and so accordingly are passed in silence. What art the poet uses to avoid the necessity of repeating a familiar tale! When Telemachus came to see Nestor he at once blocked the telling of familiar tales by saying, "We know the fate of all the others." Proteus waves the necessity of telling things already known from the *Iliad* or tradition by simply saying to Menelaus, "You were present at the battle."

Odysseus evidently had but a small place in existing tradition, as is shown by the skill and care with which the poet arouses interest in him and prepares the hearer for the outcome. Little indeed in regard to Odysseus is assumed as familiar to the hearer. The gods in the halls of Zeus discuss his fate, while even yet in Ithaca the spear-rack stands full of his spears, the son sits and sees in his mind's eye his returning father, the wife weeps for him by night and by day, the aged servant saves the best of the wine for him, the omen of birds relates to him, the aged seer foretells his coming, Athena stays long from Olympus for his sake, the son travels far in search of tidings from him, and a goddess joins therein;

Nestor can talk of little else than Odysseus, and even in the palace of the returned Menelaus there is no joy, because of the absence of this valiant friend, while Helen narrates a tale of his cunning and exploits. Everything in Olympus, Ithaca, Pylus, Sparta somehow turns toward Odysseus. No hero ever had such an introduction as the hero of the *Odyssey*; indeed the details are so many, so varied, and so minute that we are forced to believe that he was but dimly known to the poet's audience.

It was necessary not only for the poet's audience to be interested in this hero, but a second interest must be aroused and a new audience must be created eager to hear from Odysseus' own lips the story of his wanderings. Nothing told in the first four books has been told to this second audience, so that the poet must start in afresh to arouse a new interest in a new group of hearers. Not a single method of arousing interest in the first audience is repeated in the second.

When Odysseus comes into the presence of the Phaeacians he at first hides his identity and later shows such wonderful athletic ability that they are interested in him for his own sake. Then the bard repeatedly sings of the glories of Odysseus and his exploits at Troy; hence the athlete's glory won by an unnamed stranger easily merges into that of the hero. It is only by withholding the name of Odysseus that the poet can show in his presence how great was his heroic renown in the land of the Phaeacians, and it was only by the glory he had won as a nameless victor that the Phaeacians could accept without questioning and at once this unknown stranger as the illustrious Odysseus. No audience not aroused to enthusiasm by what Odysseus is and has been would listen for hours to the long story of his wanderings. The real purpose of the games and the songs was to create this enthusiasm.

When Odysseus arises to speak we know that the story of Troy is well known to the Phaeacians, since twice the bard has sung of the exploits of Odysseus at Troy. Not much has he sung, but just enough to show how familiar they are with Trojan traditions. Odysseus is thus freed from the necessity of repeating a familiar story, so that he begins at once the tales of his wanderings with these words, "The wind bearing me from Ilium brought me to the

land of the Cicones," without a single reference to the deeds done at Troy. The songs of Demodocus thus served a double purpose: they showed that Odysseus would find an audience eager to listen, but, of far greater importance, they allowed him to take for granted a knowledge of the tale of Troy and made it possible for him to begin the story of his wanderings without a reference to what had happened there. The poet was thus saved from repeating for the sake of the Phaeacians a tradition already familiar to the poet's own hearers. This is the superlative piece of poetic economy, and has strangely thus far escaped notice. Just before Odysseus leaves for Ithaca Demodocus sings again, but there is no hint in regard to the theme of his song. All that Homer tells is this: "And among them sang the divine bard Demodocus, honored by the people." There is no need now to introduce anybody or to relieve the poet from the burden of repeating a familiar tale, hence the unremembered song. Phaemius did a like service in Ithaca, since in the first book his brief song of the fate of the Achaeans shows that here also the story of Troy needs no retelling, and so accordingly even Odysseus, when he returns, although he tells his wife of his wanderings and adventures, never mentions the fact that he has been at Troy or narrates a single exploit there. Phaemius also at his last appearance is not given the honor of a theme; the poet simply tells of his music. Each bard created by his songs the impression that Trojan traditions were already known and thus Homer was saved from the necessity of telling a familiar tale.

The bard is simply a shrewd bit of poetic economy intended to relieve the poet from the necessity of repeating an existing tradition.

The fabulous exploits told in the presence of Alcinous were based, for the most part, on existing folk-lore and fairy-tales, but the finished product as it left the hand of Homer is as little like the original material as a watch-spring is like the primitive ore. Grimm has collected a mass of tales suggesting Polyphemus, tales from many lands and many peoples; but there is little poetry in them and little human interest—nothing to approach the pathos of the blinded monster when he addressed the ram. Folk-lore gave the hint, but the poet conceived the idea of connecting it with

Odysseus and of making it a poetic creation. So closely has he joined the fate of Odysseus, the blinding of Polyphemus, and the wrath of Poseidon that we can hardly separate them. It is only in the story of the Cyclops that Odysseus loses his cunning, for he, despite the urging of his companions, awaited the return of the monster, but worse than that, he awaited him in a cave with but a single way of escape. Here the poet shows a trace of the hard material in which he worked: since the hero must be trapped in the cave, he cannot be trapped and retain his cunning, yet must be trapped if he is to show his cunning in his ability to escape. Here too in defiance of his companions he tells the monster his name, and thus makes possible the monster's curse, the curse so potent in bringing disaster to Odysseus. From Grimm we know the material in which the poet worked, but how it has been transformed under the genius of Homer!

The Sirens were known to other than Homeric traditions, but in the popular mind these creatures were the embodiment of lust and loathsomeness. It was the genius of the poet which took these revolting figures of popular tradition, endowed them with the bewitching enchantment of song, and made them offer not the temptation of satisfied lust but the nobler aspirations for the attainment of knowledge.¹ The temptation the Sirens brought to Odysseus was the same that came to Eve in the garden of Eden. "For no one," said they, "has ever yet passed us by in his black ship, but having heard the sweet song from our lips, he goes on in greater joy and in greater knowledge, for we know all things, such as the Argives wrought by the will of the gods, and we know all things which occur on the fruitful earth." Although the Sirens were given the poet by tradition, yet his conception thereof rises to the dignity of a new creation. In their natural state these various myths are disconnected, in most cases there is no sequence, and the order of *Grimm's Fairy Tales* may be shifted at will; but in Homer they have a poetic sequence: the loss of eleven ships must precede the year spent with Circe, the sin against the god of the sun and his herds must precede the storm, and the loss of his companions

¹ This comment on the Sirens is largely borrowed from Jane Harrison's *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, pp. 197 f.

must precede his long stay with Calypso. Whatever all of these figures may have been in folk-lore, it was the genius of the poet who elevated them into coherent poetry and joined them with the story of Odysseus. Homer took these stories from Fairyland, gave them a human setting with human connections, and put them back in Fairyland; hence it comes that this part of the *Odyssey* has no setting in actual history or geography. Dr. Leaf shows conclusively in his *Homer and History* that from the time Odysseus passed Cythera until he touched Ithaca he was in a land of pure fancy, while the rest of the *Odyssey* belongs to a real epoch in real lands.

The *Odyssey* creates its own atmosphere and furnishes its own explanations; the known either from the *Iliad* or from tradition is assumed as known; it is only the new of which the details are given. Dr. Leaf in his *Troy*, p. 52, shows how the poet takes for granted the essential facts of the Troad except the springs, which he describes in minute detail: "The marked way in which this is done, so different from the allusive touches where other scenery is concerned, may be taken as the poet's warning that he is here drawing on his own imagination."

The poet, it seems to me, takes for granted the tales of tradition and describes only those plots or situations which are new, which he has himself created. Two of the leading themes of the *Odyssey* are the guilt of the suitors and their impending punishment. These are really one, since poetic justice demands that the innocent be spared and the guilty suffer. The feelings of the hearer would have been outraged if Odysseus had slain innocent men, or the guilty had gone unpunished; hence the poet must prepare the hearer to demand and expect the doom of the suitors. When Athena comes from Olympus she finds Telemachus "seated among the suitors, plagued at heart, anxious for the return of his father, that he himself might have power and honor." He then places a seat for his guest at a distance from the suitors, "lest he might be annoyed by the confusion, since the suitors are not civil." The suitors then come to their meal and enjoy the music and the dance with no evident marks of rudeness. Telemachus complains to his new-found friend that the suitors are consuming his unrequited substance, but as suitors they could do this without crime; Athena

tells him that, "if Odysseus came, the suitors would flee," not indeed as criminals, but as wooers of the wife, not the widow of the hero. As yet there is no notion of crime. Telemachus is advised to plan the means for expelling them, and there is a hint of what is in store when she reminds him of the glory won by Orestes in slaying Aegisthus. Later Telemachus accuses the suitors of wasting his property, to whom Antinous replies with warmth and Eurymachus with impudence, but the suitors are still only suitors, they are not criminals, either in deed or in purpose.

When Telemachus, in the second book, complains of the ruin the presence of the suitors is bringing, Zeus sends two fighting eagles, and with this as an omen Halitherses prophesies that Odysseus will return and take vengeance on the suitors; Eurymachus then threatens the seer with violence and crows the spirit of Telemachus; Mentor tries to calm their violence and threatens them with risking their own lives; Leocritus replies, "Even if Odysseus should come he would meet certain and immediate death at their hands." Athena comes in the guise of Mentor and assures Telemachus that the suitors are preparing their own doom, the doom which is near and by which they shall all perish in a single day. This chord which sounded so feebly at first is now loud and clear. When Telemachus tells his nurse that he is going to Pylos or Sparta, she begs him remain at home, since the suitors will plan to slay him and divide his possessions. Later when he is in Sparta and tells of the violence of the suitors, Menelaus compares their fate when Odysseus returns with that of a hind which had put her young in the lair of an absent lion. While Telemachus is on his journey Antinous proposes that the suitors man a ship and slay him as he returns. No one opposes this outrageous suggestion, but it is greeted with enthusiasm by all; hence all the suitors are murderers in plan and heart. They are willing to slay the son of their king, they deserve death. With these few strokes the poet has made the hearer feel that the suitors are not merely impolite youngsters who deserve reproof, but actual murderers who merit death.

At the end of book IV the character of the suitors is known, and their punishment is clearly foretold. It can hardly be that this

slow development of character and the delayed glimpse of its consequences is nothing but the telling of an old and familiar tale.

The evident effort to prepare the hearer for the fate of the suitors by showing that they are doomed and that they deserve their doom is strong proof that Odysseus and the suitors had no connection in existing tradition.

The hints furnished by tradition were vague and few. Odysseus was already known as a shrewd and daring warrior, the son of Laertes, the lord of a distant and rugged isle, and it was just this fact that he was from remote and barren Ithaca and was surprisingly clever that made him so well fitted to the poetic purposes of a poem dealing with fables and fancies.¹

The poet took his hints from tradition, but he did not repeat the tradition, and his own motto was put into the mouth of his hero who said to the Phaeacians, "You already know this, and it is grievous unto me to repeat a thing which is already known." The poet like Odysseus repeated little or nothing to his hearers with which they were already familiar.

The character of Odysseus, his home in Ithaca, the name of his son and of his father, and the fact of his return were the gifts of tradition, but the plot of the *Odyssey* and its treatment are pure poetic and original fiction. It was this invention, this substitution and addition which so scandalized Hesiod whose honest shepherd's heart protests that "the Muses know how to utter falsehoods in a way that makes them seem to be true." "But the Muses," he adds, "know how to utter the truth also." It was Hesiod's privilege to tell the truth; he wrote the truth and no one can doubt that his genealogies are the traditional truth. Homer made a different claim for the bard, since he regarded him as inspired and self-taught, *ab-to-διδακτος*; but "self-taught" must mean something far different from a vehicle for conveying existing traditions. I can think of no two words which would so little apply to a poet who handed on the existing traditions as the two words "inspired" and "self-taught."

¹ I am delighted to read this sentence in Dr. Leaf's *Homer and History*, p. 280: "And it is hardly possible to suppose that Penelope had any substantial existence before the composition of the *Odyssey*."

The *Odyssey* has neither of the two distinguishing marks of traditional literature, genealogies and repetitions; it avoids telling the known; it assumes the existence of a great mass of traditions; it hints at these traditions but avoids repeating them. Whatever tradition there may be in the *Odyssey* is only an accidental glimpse at the setting. The action and the plot are new and original creations.

This paper was written before Dr. Leaf had published *Homer and History*, and the only important changes made have been the quotations from that work. It is gratifying to me to see how we have independently reached, in so many cases, the same conclusions.

THE DORCHESTER EXPERIMENT IN VOCATIONAL LATIN: A REPORT OF PROGRESS¹

BY ALBERT S. PERKINS
Dorchester High School, Boston

During the last few years one idea has come to the front in the educational world, and today occupies the center of the stage; that idea is embodied in the word "vocational." From the kindergarten through the high school, intelligent teachers, in general, and vocational counselors, in particular, are expected and required, not only to study the tendencies of the adolescent mind, but to note its possibilities, and in the most effective way to prepare it for that calling in life for which it seems best fitted. As a result, both in the vocational school and in the high school and college, marked emphasis is placed on the practical, and any study which does not appear to have a direct bearing on the calling which lies beyond is looked upon with suspicion, or even contempt. "I intend to be a business man," exclaims the callow high school youth. "Why should I study algebra, or science, or Latin?" Unfortunately, in deciding the momentous question of what studies to take, only too often the parent plays no part, except, perhaps, to write a letter, insisting that the boy avoid the cultural subject and take one which he thinks, or pretends to think, prepares directly for the future vocation. Strangely enough it happens, not unfrequently, that educated men, who might be expected to stand firm, or at least to speak a good word for the classics, are among the first to give way. "I wasted six years of my life on Latin and Greek," exclaimed an intelligent and refined man to me not long ago, "and I am determined that my boy shall not repeat the mistake."²

¹ Read before the annual meeting of the Classical Association of New England, 1916.

² Also note the following from the *Boston Transcript*, March 29, 1916, p. 32: "Greek has passed away, though Latin lingers moribund" (report to Finance Commission).

In such an atmosphere, it is not strange that classical teachers should take it for granted, or even admit, that their studies, the time-honored Greek and Latin, are not practical in the sense of being vocational. Thus it happens that we have given way and, perhaps, without realizing the consequences, have fallen back on a second line of defense. "Greek and Latin may not have a direct bearing upon the future calling," we say, "but these studies do train the mind as no practical subject can, thus giving the future man of affairs superior power to solve the complicated problems which await him." In proof of this contention long tables of statistics are presented, showing beyond question that classical students, who later specialized in something else, have done better work in the second field than those who specialized in it from the beginning. The weak point in the argument is the fact—for I fear it is a fact—that the classical people were superior to the non-classical in natural ability, and would have outdistanced them, even if they had never studied Greek or Latin. But this is not all. Of late we have been confronted by a startling educational dictum, originating with the Herbartians, and confirmed, it is claimed, in the psychological laboratory, to the effect that mental power acquired in one field cannot be transferred to a second and different field, unless there are identical factors. A man, for example, by mastering Latin forms, syntax, and vocabulary, acquires mental power for interpreting Latin literature, but, according to modern psychology, such power cannot be transformed into the kind of intellectual force required for mastering the problems of organic chemistry, we will say, or for understanding the theory of waves in the electromagnetic ether, or for interpreting the complicated phenomena of the business world.

If these conclusions with reference to formal discipline are sound, it is time that classical men should look around for a third line of defense. For one, however, I am tired of so much retreating. How would it do to give up defensive tactics entirely and try a drive at the one weak place in the opposing lines? Strangely enough, this vulnerable point is of the enemy's own choosing, namely, where the vocational idea appears so strongly intrenched. To drop the figure, would it not be well to see if we cannot demon-

strate that Latin in the truest sense is vocational?¹ that of all studies which a boy or girl may take in high school or in college nothing is really more practical than Latin, and that instead of dropping it from the place it now occupies, we should extend it to the vocational school—and for the simple reason that, in reality, it is a bread-and-butter study, and that it is capable of increasing the earning capacity of our young men and women as few of the so-called vocational studies can? For is it not a fact that no educational course, even when it seems most practical, is complete and truly vocational if it fails to train in English vocabulary building? Now, in the Dorchester High School we think we have demonstrated that English vocabulary building can be taught in no way more effectively than through the study of Latin. It is of the progress we have made in this vocabulary Latin or vocational Latin which I am here today to tell you about.

Perhaps, first of all, I should give you the history of the Dorchester experiment, even at the expense of repeating what I have said before in two earlier papers.² About five years ago, Mr. W. L. Anderson, head of the commercial department in the Dorchester High School, with the unanimous approval of the teachers in the department, asked that Latin be placed in the commercial course, on the ground that through the study of this language English vocabulary could be most effectively taught. As a matter of fact, Mr. Anderson had found, from the actual experience of his pupils, that, next to a knowledge of the commercial branches themselves, there could be no stronger asset for a high-school graduate, either in getting a position at the start, or in securing promotion later, than a thorough mastery of English vocabulary; while, on the other hand, lack of English vocabulary was an obstacle well-nigh insuperable.

So it came about that Latin was made an elective in the commercial department, and in the fall of 1911 we began the two years' course, modestly enough, with but one section of about forty

¹ See *Classical Journal*, October, 1914, pp. 7-8.

² "Latin as a Practical Study," *Classical Journal*, VIII, No. 7 (April, 1913); and "Latin as a Vocational Study in the Commercial Course," *Classical Journal*, X, No. 1 (October, 1914).

pupils. Last year interest in the subject had increased to such a degree that there were seven sections in the school, consisting of nearly 275 pupils.

At this point I am glad to state that the movement has spread to other Boston high schools. A year ago a vocational Latin class of selected pupils of the commercial department was established in the West Roxbury High School. This year there are two sections. A few months ago, in the South Boston High School, Miss Clara W. Barnes, head of the department of ancient languages, established three classes of vocational Latin, consisting not of first-year pupils, as in Dorchester, but of upper-class students. I am watching the experiment with no little interest. To me the most surprising development of the idea has taken place in the Roxbury High School. Here all first-year commercial pupils, eight sections in all, are required to take vocational Latin. Of course, there were not enough Latin teachers in the school for so many new classes; consequently the work was given over to the French department. Fortunately Miss Mary T. Laughlin, head of the department of modern languages, is an excellent classical scholar. One feature of the Roxbury experiment may lead to interesting developments: the Latin side of the subject is being presented largely from the conversational point of view.

With reference to interest in vocational Latin outside of Boston, I am constantly in receipt of letters of inquiry. I have already more than a hundred, and they come not only from New England and the Middle States, as might be expected, but from such widely separated localities as places in Idaho, Colorado, Washington, Oregon, Kansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Illinois, Mississippi, North Carolina, the cities of Louisville, Baltimore, and Richmond, and even from Canada. Strangely enough a few months ago a letter arrived from Sydney, Australia, asking for details with reference to the "innovation of the course in commercial Latin." I am glad to state, also, that interest in the subject, in some cases at least, does not stop with letters of inquiry. Since the beginning of the present school year, I have been informed that in no less than six of these cases Latin has already been placed in the high school commercial course. Only a few days ago word came that "a two

years' course in Latin is being planned by the course of study committee in Columbus, Ohio, for the High School of Commerce, following the lines of the two articles in the *Classical Journal*,¹ to which I have previously referred. Nor is this all. In Rochester, New York, the excellent work of Dr. Gray in this field has already attracted wide attention. Encouraging words, also, have come from Miss Myra Hanson, of Toledo, who has taken up the work with no little enthusiasm and success. Another firm believer in the vocational side of Latin is Miss Frances Sabin, of the normal department of the University of Wisconsin, who is instructing her prospective teachers how to impart English vocabulary through the Latin in a scientific as well as in a practical way.

In the University of Pittsburgh, also, the English derivative idea has taken firm root. In fact, Dr. Ullman, head of the department of Latin, tells me that he has found from experience in the classroom, both at Pittsburgh and in the summer school of the University of Chicago, that association of English derivative with Latin original tends to do away with the *dictionary habit*—an evil, in the opinion of many, even more serious than the use of a translation. Dr. Ullman's method of procedure with an unknown Latin word is of interest: first the student tries to think of an English derivative; if unsuccessful, he endeavors to associate a kindred Latin word with the one being studied; and then, as a last resort, falls back on the context. After testing this method for several months, I agree with Dr. Ullman that in a great majority of cases the English derivative, even when its present definition has departed perceptibly from the Latin, will suggest the meaning of the unknown Latin word.

But I must not dwell too long on this phase of my subject, for I am here today, not so much to inform you how widespread the vocabulary building idea may have become, but rather to outline briefly just what we have accomplished in Dorchester. In the first place, I desire to refer to the starting-point of all our work, the Latin word-list. This has been built up by selecting the Latin words leading to English derivatives from the vocabularies of authors commonly read for admission to college: Cicero, twelve or thirteen orations; Caesar, *Gallic War*; Nepos; Ovid; the

vocabulary of the complete works of Vergil; and such words from the vocabulary of the younger Pliny, Catullus, Tibullus, Plautus, and Horace as are found in Greenough, D'Ooge, and Daniell's *Second Year Latin*. Many other Latin words I have obtained by reading commercial textbooks, English spellers and rhetorics, and various works of English literature, and tracing derivatives back to their Latin originals. Among the English works which I have scoured in my search for Latin words are the following: Tennyson's *In Memoriam*, *Death of Arthur*, *Princess*, *Idylls of the King*; Shakespeare's *Macbeth*, *Hamlet*, and *Julius Caesar*; Milton's *Shorter Poems* and *Paradise Lost*; Carlyle's *Essay on Burns*, *Hero Worship*, and *Sartor Resartus*; Burke's *Speech on Conciliation*; *Silas Marner*; Franklin's *Autobiography*; Webster's *Speeches*; textbooks in commercial law, commercial geography, history of commerce, and other commercial subjects, and, lately, works of Walter Pater and De Quincey, and Cardinal Newman's *Sermons* and *Apologia pro mea vita*. Of course, the list is not complete. But thus far I have culled 1,107 Latin roots, which lead, perhaps, to the most important words in the English language. Of these 1,107 Latin words, or collections of Latin words, some yield only a few derivatives, while others, as *stō* and *faciō* (without counting the suffix *-fy*), give nearly 200.

The derivatives and definitions were obtained partly from Webster's *Secondary School Dictionary*, the book used by pupils in the Latin class, but mostly from the revised *Century*. For Latin etymology I have used Dr. Walde's "Etymological Dictionary" (*lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* [Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitäts Buchhandlung, 1910]), which I was fortunate in ordering just before the war broke out.

The first year of the course is for the most part taken up with the word-list. Upon this as a basis I have prepared, with no little care as to detail, a series of sixty exercises. Words are selected for vocabularies, and sentences made, both Latin into English and English into Latin, which the pupils translate, as in the ordinary beginners' books. Of course, also, forms must be mastered and principles of syntax made familiar. The distinctive feature of the lessons, however, is the work with English deri-

vation. Whenever a Latin word is met which yields English derivatives—and most of the words are of this character, since practically all of them are taken from the word-list—the pupil records it in his index book, together with the page in the derivative notebook to which he assigns it. Here he also records it, and below, with the parts of speech and definitions, places as many English derivatives as he is able to find in Webster's *Secondary School Dictionary*, which is furnished each student. The index book is obtained at the Woolworth Stores for the modest sum of one cent. The derivative notebook, about $7 \times 8\frac{1}{2}$ inches, which is furnished by the city, contains 80-100 pages, and costs about ten cents.

After the class has had some experience in associating English derivatives with Latin originals, prefixes,¹ usually in the form of prepositions, are gradually given, and about Thanksgiving time complete lists, which I have had printed on the multigraph, are pasted on the inside of the cover of the derivative notebook. From this time on the pupil is expected to test all Latin roots he meets with these prefixes, taken in alphabetical order, and to record the derivatives. In the case of a verb, this is done with both the present and the supine stem. On each page of the notebook, about an inch and a half from the left, a line is drawn in red ink. The Latin word with its meaning is placed to the right of this line and all derivatives, with the parts of speech, below to the left, with definitions on the same line at the right. To illustrate what I mean, I will show a sample page (p. 138) of a pupil's derivative notebook, taking the verb *quatiō, quassum* (in composition *-cutiō, -cussum*), "shake." This word is met in September of the second year, when the class reads the *Haunted House*. Both the simple verb and the compound, *concutiō*, occur in this letter of Pliny.

As time goes on we try to associate as many kindred Latin words as possible, and thus bring together English derivatives which have running through them a common meaning. Thus,

¹ Prefixes.—*a* or *ab* or *abs*, *ad*, *am* or *amb*, *ante*, *anti*, *bi* or *bis*, *circum*, *cis*, *con*, *contra* or *counter*, *de*, *di* or *dis*, *e* or *ex*, *en*, *extra*, *in* or *un* (not), *in*, *infra*, *inter*, *intra*, *intro*, *iuxta*, *non*, *ob*, *per*, *post*, *prae*, *praeter*, *por*, *re*, *retro*, *se* or *sed*, *sine*, *sub*, *subter*, *super* or *sur*, *trans*, *ultra*.

in the case of *stō*, we consider not only the two stems, or bases, of the word itself, but also *sistō*, *statuō*, and *statūtus*. I would state, in passing, that special care is taken not to confuse the boys and girls with technical definitions of *stem*, *base*, or *root*, but to teach

SAMPLE PAGE OF PUPIL'S DERIVATIVE NOTEBOOK

QUATIŌ, QUASSUM (IN COMPOSITION, -CUTIŌ, -CUSSUM), "SHAKE"

Quash, v.,	to beat down or in pieces, to crush, put an end to
Quassation, n.,	the act of shaking, or the state of being shaken
Quassative, a.,	tremulous, easily shaken
Concussion, n.,	the act of shaking or agitating, especially by the stroke or impact of another body, state of being shaken, the shock caused by two bodies coming suddenly and violently into collision
Concussive, a.,	having the power or quality of shaking by sudden or violent stroke or impulse
Concubine, a.,	coming suddenly into collision, colliding
Discuss, v.,	agitate, debate, reason upon
Discussable, a.,	
Discusser, n.,	
Discussion, n.,	debate, argument about something
Discussional, a.,	of or pertaining to discussion
Discussive, n.,	a medicine that disperses or scatters, a discutient
Discutient, { a.,	dispersing morbid matter
Discutient, { n.,	a medicine or application which disperses a swelling or effusion
Percuss, v.,	to strike against so as to shake or give a shock to
Percussion, n.,	the act of percussing, or the striking of one body against another with some violence, the state of being percussed, the shock produced by the collision of bodies
Percussional, a.,	of or pertaining to percussion, or a light sharp stroke, striking against something
Percussive, { a.,	in music an instrument of percussion, as the drums
Percussively, n.,	
Percussor, n.,	one who or that which strikes, an agent or instrument of percussion
Percutient, { a.,	percussive, of or pertaining to percussion
Percutient, { n.,	that which strikes or has the power to strike
Rescue, v.,	(re, ex, -cutiō), to liberate, release, free from confinement, danger, or violence or evil
Rescuer, n.,	one who rescues

them to look for English words made up in the same way as the Latin originals, with the endings left off. From the very start pupils are required to compose sentences, both orally and in writing, containing derivatives of the Latin words; they are taught to look for Latin roots in English words they come upon in their school work, or outside reading, and to compare the spelling of derivatives with that of Latin originals. Frequent written tests and dictation exercises are also given. Of course, during the first year we do not require the pupils to study more than about 650 of the 1,107 Latin words in the word-list, nor do we expect them to remember all the derivatives recorded in the notebook. But we do expect them to know the meanings of these Latin words from the word-list, to be familiar with not a few important derivatives, and by all means to have acquired some facility in recognizing Latin roots in English words they meet. Toward the end of the first year, in the commercial classes, simple stories in Collar's *Gradatim* are read, chiefly for practice in sight work, though here, also, a few Latin words leading to English derivatives are found and recorded.

The second year of the course is devoted to reading, and derivatives are noted as the Latin originals are met. In the selection of the Latin to be read, while I have made the derivative side the chief aim, yet I have also endeavored to take the subject-matter into account, with the hope not only of stimulating interest, but, if possible, of creating a sense of literary appreciation.*

As I have already stated, during the two years' course pupils have not only recorded derivatives, with parts of speech and definitions, as they have met the Latin originals, but have composed sentences, both orally and in writing, containing derivatives of the Latin words, and have had frequent written tests and dictation exercises. Nor do we stop here. Almost from the beginning we try to train the student to look for Latin roots in the English words he meets in his commercial geography, commercial law, history of commerce, or other school work, or outside reading, and from the Latin words trace the meaning of the English derivatives. Pupils are asked to write down difficult English words, which

* *Classical Journal*, October, 1914, pp. 10, 11.

appear to be of Latin origin, whenever they see them, and once every week, during the second year, to bring three such words into the class. Here the words are discussed, their meanings traced, and if any Latin word is found which has not come up before, it is recorded with its derivatives in the notebook, exactly as if it had been met in the authors read. A large number of Latin words included in the word-list are found by the pupils in this way. One of the interesting words we met a year ago this fall, after the war had broken out, was "moratorium." Another word brought into the class for discussion at that time was "exacerbities," which was used by Lord Russell in giving the reasons for the breaking out of hostilities. The pupils derived no little satisfaction in tracing the word through *ex*, *acerbus*, and back to *acer*, thus taking note of the *sharp, bitter* feelings which had grown out of Germany's action in taking Alsace-Lorraine in 1871. As a matter of fact, exacerbity is not found in the *Century Dictionary*, and is an illustration of the tendency to draw upon the Latin, even at the present time, in coining new English words.

Two words brought into class this fall, both found in commercial geography, led to Latin words in the word-list, which the pupils had not met in their reading, namely, "alluvial" and "dentifrice." *Lavō* (*luō*), "wash," and *fricō*, "rub," with a large number of derivatives, were promptly recorded in the notebooks. In order still more effectively to develop the ability to see the Latin in English words, every day each pupil brings into class one English word of Latin origin, to the discussion of which five minutes of the lesson are devoted. To encourage the selection of important derivatives from day to day, students are marked, not for their knowledge of such words, but for their judgment in making the selection.¹

¹ Examples of words met in commercial or other school work, or in outside reading, and brought into class for discussion: saponify, farinaceous, apiary, supraliminal, malleable, dentifrice, impeccable, excerpt, dextrose, levulose, corrugated, herbivora, vitreous, alluvial, antediluvian, alibi, indemnity, segregation, igneous, intramedullary, illicit, litigation, longevity, translucent, (exacerbity), denudation, centrifugal, primogeniture, supernatant, exonerate, impecunious, argentiferous, predatory, eradicate, ramification, derelict, delinquency, salvage, transcendentalism, insidious, somnambulist, intervention.

There is another phase of the work upon which much emphasis is laid, namely, the correlation of the spelling of English derivatives with Latin originals. In hundreds of cases the spelling of English words is determined by that of the Latin words from which they are derived.¹ Take, for example, the word "belligerent," which we have seen so often in the papers during the last year or two. If a boy sees that the first part is from *bellum*, "war," with the two *l*'s, and *ger* of *gerō*, with the next vowel *e*, because of the *e* conjugation, and the *-nt* of the present participle, he should have no trouble in spelling it "bell-i-ger-e-nt." Note that pupils divide words into syllables with reference to the Latin originals. *Animus* is another important Latin word, which I have placed in the lessons early in the first year, together with *aequus* and *magnus*. So at the very beginning we get "equ-animity" and "magn-animity," as well as "ad-equate" and "in-ad-equate." By the way, in connection with *animus* an interesting circumstance occurred some months ago at the time of Mr. Bryan's resignation from the Cabinet. In June one of the boys of the class saw the word "pusillanimous" in the newspapers. He wrote it down at the time, and last fall promptly brought it into class. It is needless to say that all, teachers as well as pupils, experienced no little pleasure in tracing the word from the root *pu-* in the familiar *puer*, the diminutive *l*'s (through *pusillus*), and *animus*.

At this point permit me to say a word in answer to a persistent objection raised by teachers of commercial subjects. "All will admit," they say, "that a good English vocabulary is an invaluable asset for a business man or a business woman, but why wade through the study of Latin to get it? Since so many English words are merely Latin with the endings left off, why not study directly the Latin words themselves—your word-list, if you please—but leave out Latin forms and syntax, and by all means the tedious and painful process of translating?"

¹ English derivatives; spelling (*a few samples*): immigration, emigration, ossify, capillary, aberration, beneficial, deliquescent, infinite, inflammable, belligerent, laboratory, dilapidated, delegate, malefactor, mammillary, omniscience, associate, solder, annuity, currency, mortgage, annihilation, Mediterranean, putrefy.

In reply to this objection, I may say that it takes only a short experience in teaching vocational Latin to discover that a student, in order to build up his English vocabulary, must accomplish two things: he must first master the meaning of Latin roots, and after that be able to trace derivatives. Now, it is obvious that it is utterly impossible to trace the meaning of derivatives if one does not know what the Latin originals mean. And how can the meaning of Latin roots be fixed in the memory so effectively as by the time-honored practice of translation, with the help of forms and syntax? In fact, is it not virtually impossible to remember the meaning of a Latin root without observing how the different words into which it enters are used in relation to other words in sentences? As well might one try to acquire the English language by committing the dictionary to memory!

Some time ago I made an interesting and, as I think, important discovery, namely, that ability to recognize English derivatives in Latin words is an invaluable aid in reading at sight. Of course, pupils must commit to memory the meanings of a large number of Latin words, especially during the first two years; they must understand Latin syntax and read large amounts of Latin. But when they do all this, they are lamentably weak in ability to read at sight. Now, in the preparation of each lesson, if pupils are taught to proceed as if reading at sight, and in addition are able to associate English derivatives whose meanings they know, with Latin words whose meanings they may not know, I am convinced, after a six months' trial, not only that the sight problem is solved, but that much of the drudgery of preparing a Latin lesson may be avoided. As a result of this conviction, and especially on account of the fact that pupils going to college, of all people, should have a broad and flexible English vocabulary, in the Dorchester High School we have extended the work in English vocabulary through the Latin to the college-preparatory department, and require these classes to begin with the Latin word-list, in the same way as students in the commercial department. Of course, in the commercial sections we emphasize vocabulary building, while in the college-preparatory work we lay just as much stress upon the subject as time will permit.

In conclusion, there are two recommendations which I should like to make: first, that a requirement in English derivatives from the Latin be added to the present requirements for admission to college, but with the proviso that the total amount of time to be devoted to the study of Latin in the preparatory school shall not be increased; and, secondly, that a country-wide series of measurements of Latin and non-Latin pupils be made. With regard to the first recommendation, while leaving details to experts, I should most strongly recommend that pupils present derivative notebooks, like the laboratory notebooks in physics or chemistry, and that an examination be given by the College Entrance Board, to test knowledge of English derivatives from given Latin words, the force of prefixes, the use of English words of Latin origin in sentences composed by the student, and, most important of all, ability to see the Latin in English words, and thus to determine their meaning.

The recommendation for the country-wide measurements was suggested to me last summer by Miss Sabin of the University of Wisconsin, to whom I have previously referred in this paper. Miss Sabin said in effect: "Of course, the measurements' made by the English department of the Dorchester High School were valuable, but you can hardly expect them to convince the whole educational world of the superiority of the Latin training. Why, therefore, should we not have a series of measurements that would be convincing, extending from the Lakes to the Gulf, and

* MEASUREMENTS

	AVERAGES	
	Latin	Non-Latin
January and February 1914—		
1. Spelling.....	82.5	72.6
2. Use of words in sentences.....	57.5	40.6
3. Definitions and parts of speech.....	69.5	33.3
4. Meaning of words and spelling.....	57.0	27.5
5. Excellence in vocabulary.....	36.0	6.8
June, 1913—		
6. Meaning of words and spelling.....	65.3	12.3
	6)367.80	6)193.1
	61.30	32.18
Difference.....	32.18
	29.12	

from Maine to California, testing groups of Latin and non-Latin pupils, who are of the same ability, of equal numbers, and in the same courses?" That is to say, all over this broad land of ours measure groups of commercial Latin and commercial non-Latin pupils, college-preparatory Latin and college-preparatory non-Latin, general Latin and general non-Latin, college students who have had Latin and college students who have not, but in any school or college always in groups of two, always with the same number of students, and especially always with students of equal ability.

Nor would I confine such measurements to English vocabulary work. Perhaps a method might be devised of measuring the mental power of Latin and non-Latin students, thus throwing further light upon the time-honored theory of formal discipline. In the selection of a committee to take charge of these measurements, care should be taken to choose men of undisputed fairness, disinterestedness, and ability, whose conclusions would be accepted as final by the whole educational world.

As I close, I wish to say in all seriousness, that in my judgment the classics in the public high school are today battling for their very life. Here, in the opinion of many, the issue is to be decided. Just now there is a lull in the conflict—the calm of twilight, say our enemies, a *Götterdämmerung*, soon to be followed by the night which is destined to swallow up in its blackness the mighty gods of Greece and Rome. But the battle is not yet over. We still have ample reserves in the undeniable fact that so large a proportion of our most valuable English words are derived from the Latin. In the battle for good English, also, which is now raging in school and college, and in the business world the country over, there is at the present moment desperate need of reinforcements. But where can reinforcements be found so serviceable and so sturdy as the Greek and Latin of the ages? Finally, in extending the work in Latin to vocational classes, we have the satisfaction of realizing that we confer a genuine benefit upon society when we add to the earning capacity of young men and women in the fierce competition of life by giving them that great and undisputed asset, increased power in the use of the mother-tongue.

Notes

[Contributions in the form of notes or discussions should be sent to John A. Scott, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.]

APPRECIATION OF NATURE IN THE *ILIAS* AND THE *ODYSSEY*

Professor Grace Harriet Macurdy, in *Class. Quart.*, VIII, 212 ff., advanced the argument that the "*Odyssey* differs from the *Iliad* not only in knowing Zeus less in his aspect of Sky—that is, *aether*-God, but in its lack of sensibility to all the phenomena of the heaven—'Fire and hail, snow and vapors, wind and storm fulfilling his word.' " This reasoning and the proofs thereof have been welcomed with enthusiasm by Miss Jane Harrison, who, in *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* for 1915, p. 76, quoting the statement that the *Odyssey* differs from the *Iliad* in the lack of sensibility to all the phenomena of heaven, says: "These are words to brood over. Vassar College is much to be congratulated on its professor, the new *χωρίζοντα*."

All arguments which I have ever examined have failed to show any difference between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*; abstracts, articles, similes, patronymics, do not stand the test, but this particular argument has plainly been worked out with a care that precludes false statistics.

No two poems can be different poems yet have exactly the same markings. Does this difference rest on the different conceptions of the poems, conceptions arising in one mind, or is it too fundamental to admit of identity of authorship?

It is to be granted at once that the *Iliad* has more references to the sky, stars, and the moon than the *Odyssey*. The action of the *Iliad* and its setting were out of doors, the warriors were in the field, while the action of the *Odyssey* is for the most part under roof. We move from palace to palace. First we are in Ithaca, then in Pylos, then in Sparta, then with Alcinous, then back in Ithaca. Nature withdraws as we stand under cover, and the average person learns more of the "phenomena of heaven" in one week's camping than he could in a lifetime in the city. The weather is only an incident in towns, while it governs everything in the tent and the field. Practically every telegram now coming from the battlefields of Europe refers to the weather, while in normal times this subject is almost ignored. Every camper can tell you at once the condition of the moon the night before, while few in the city could.

The *Odyssey* gives so little opportunity for the poet to refer to clouds, storms, sky, and the Zeus of the rains, that I was surprised to learn how much use he had made of that opportunity. Zeus is referred to more than twenty times by some epithet such as "cloud-wrapped," "cloud-gathering," "loud-roaring," "high-thunderer," or "delighting-in-the-lightning," and he is repeatedly referred to as the source of storms, wrecks, or as hurling his bolts, v 132,

160, δ 173, ε 128, 132, 304, 409, η 250 i, 67, μ 313, 415, ξ 235, 305, 457, φ 413, ω 42, 539. The first book of the *Odyssey* in which the actor is away from home and out in the open is ε, and in no part of the *Iliad* does Zeus appear more frequently as wielding the lightning and the storm; and this is true of all the out-of-door scenes of the *Odyssey*.

The less frequent references to the phenomena of the heaven do not show any "less sensibility to natural phenomena" but do show that storms, clouds, and the sky mean more to men living in camps or the field than they do to the inhabitants of towns. It is only when men are out in the open that they point to the stars. Homer was too familiar with this trait to ignore it in his poetry. Had there been as many references to the sky, the stars, and the heavens in the *Odyssey* as in the *Iliad*, when their setting is so different, then we might have a real *Chorizontic Argument*.

However, there is one chorizontic argument of the most far-reaching importance which has thus far escaped attention, namely, the *Iliad* refers to beans, κίαμοι, the *Odyssey* does not. Why this silence? The poet of the *Odyssey* knew beans, and his silence must have been due to some ceremonial scruple, some religious taboo. Where was such a taboo on beans? Not at Athens, for the officials were chosen by beans. Lucian tells us that in Athens all the officials were thus chosen, and Herodotus, Thucydides, as well as Aristophanes, point in the same direction.

We must turn from Athens in our search for the land of this taboo on beans, and our trail leads straight to the school of Pythagoras and its motto: κνάμων ἀπέχεσθαι. These are words to ponder over, for this gives us a definite clue to the date and land of the *Odyssey*.

I am baffled by a second discovery. The poet of the *Odyssey* refers to birds and poultry, but he never mentions eggs. Whither does this point us? Like Wilamowitz in his *Hom. Untersuchungen*, I can only say, "Das führt uns weiter und weiter, weg von Ithaka und den Abenteuern des Meeres, von dem irdischen and heroischen weg, hinauf, hinauf zu den Göttern."

JOHN A. SCOTT

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

XENOPHON *Anabasis* i. 8. 13

In reading lately once more Xenophon's *Anabasis* i. 8. 13, in the edition of Professor A. T. Murray (1914), I came upon an interpretation of two participles to which I have long taken exception. The passage runs as follows: ὅρῶν δὲ ὁ Κλέαρχος τὸ μέσον στίφος καὶ ἀκούων Κύρου ἔξω ὅντα τοῦ εὐωνύμου βασιλέα, τοσοῦτον γάρ πλήθει περιήν βασιλεὺς ὥστε μέσον τῶν ἔντοῦ ἔχων τοῦ Κύρου εὐωνύμου ἔξω ἦν, ἀλλ' ὅμως ὁ Κλέαρχος οὐν ἥθελεν ἀποσπᾶσαι ἀπὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ τὸ δεξιὸν κέρας, φοβούμενος μὴ κυκλωθείη ἐκατέρωθεν, κ.τ.λ.

Professor Murray has this note: "ὅρῶν, although he saw; so ἀκούων, below." Similar comments on ὅρῶν, making the participle equivalent to a concessive

(adversative) clause, may be found in the editions of MacMichael and Melhuish (1888), Kelsey and Zenos (1891), Goodwin and White (1896), and Mather and Hewitt (1910). Into German editions I have not thought it worth while to look. It is enough and more than enough that an explanation so palpably false has found its way into editions by thoroughly competent American scholars, editions, too, that have been most in use in America. I say the interpretation is palpably false, because one has only to translate the whole passage to see that *όρων* and *ἀκούων* cannot be concessive (adversative). Would it be sensible to say the following? "*Though Klearchos saw the compact mass in the center, and though he heard from Cyrus that the king was beyond his left wing* [i.e., though he heard from Cyrus that the king far outnumbered him, and so was in position to outflank him and the whole force of Cyrus—a movement the Greeks manifestly dreaded, as we see in part from the fact that originally they drew up their line of battle with the Euphrates on their right flank, and later, according to i. 10. 9, purposed to put the river behind them], *he was nevertheless unwilling to withdraw the wing from the river*, fearing that he might be surrounded."

To say that would be as sensible as to say "he was unwilling to withdraw the wing from the river, though he feared that he might be surrounded."

No, *όρων*, *ἀκούων*, and *φοβούμενος* are all alike causal rather than adversative in connotation.

How, then, did competent scholars make the mistake of taking either or both of the first two of these participles as concessive (adversative) in connotation? They were misled by *όμως* in *ἄλλ' ὅμως ὁ Κλέαρχος οὐκ ἤθελεν, κ.τ.λ.*, and by their punctuation of the text, i.e., by the fact that they had set off *τοσοῦτον γάρ . . . ἔξω ἦν* by dashes, as parenthetical.

Now, in fact, *όμως* is in opposition, not at all to the ideas contained in *όρων* and *ἀκούων*, but to the idea contained in the participle *ἔχων*, which stands in the (so-called) parenthesis. The quasi-parenthetical sentence can, of course, mean only one thing: "for so marked was the numerical superiority of the king's forces that, *though he commanded the center* [only] *of his army, he was nevertheless beyond the left wing of Cyrus' whole force.*" Should anyone doubt this, he should be convinced by *Anabasis* i. 8. 23: *καὶ βασιλεὺς δῆ τότε μέσον ἔχων τῆς αὐτοῦ στρατιᾶς δῆμος ἔξω ἐγένετο τοῦ Κύρου εὐωνύμου κέρατος.*

Now, if what has been said above is right, the introduction of *όμως* into the passage after the resumptive *ἄλλ'* is a logical flaw, since, to repeat, *όμως* is in opposition, not to anything in the main proposition, with which we are now by virtue of the position of *όμως* again dealing, but to something in a subordinate proposition. This logical flaw is made worse if we set off, as some do, *τοσοῦτον γάρ . . . ἔξω ἦν* by dashes.

One may be glad, however, that Xenophon was guilty of the logical flaw, for his introduction of *όμως* at the point where he in fact set it teaches some important lessons. First, it shows how sensitive Xenophon was, and we may,

no doubt, add, the Greeks in general were, to the varying shades of meaning, to what some call the *nuances*, of the participle (here $\epsilon\chi\omega\sigma$). Secondly, we see that clauses which we incline to regard as parenthetical, or as of the nature of footnotes, were, after all, to the Greek closely knit into the fabric of his paragraph. I am reminded here of my deep-rooted objection to the growing tendency, in modern editions of Latin authors, to point with a period before *nam*-clauses. As I have elsewhere remarked, the Greeks and the Romans thought and wrote in longer sentences than are now current in English; they thought and read in the large, not in snippets, as we do. Lastly, we have all noted, unhappily many times, that, if an editor of a Greek or a Latin classic made it his unvarying practice to translate his author in full as part of his preparation for his editorial labors, commentaries on the classics would lack many a blemish by which they are now marred. One who tries to translate our passage will find, if he has a grasp of its real logic, that he must not translate $\delta\mu\omega\sigma$ at all.

CHARLES KNAPP

BARNARD COLLEGE
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

General Comment

[Edited by Gilbert Campbell Scoggin, The University of Missouri.]

Professor Guy Vowles, of the department of Latin at Fargo College, North Dakota, is the editor of Björnson's *En Glad Gut*. The volume has already been adopted as a textbook in several colleges.

Sir William Ramsay has recently given the course of Gifford Lectures at the University of Edinburgh, taking for his subject, "The Development of Religious Thought and Rites in the Borderland between Greece and the East."

Professor Louis E. Lord, of Oberlin College, contributed a letter to the *Nation* for August 3, dealing with "The Carnegie Foundation." He assembles in concise form some very telling objections against President Pritchett's proposed insurance scheme; and one wonders just what course of action could now reinstate the Foundation in the public confidence. Most, if not all, teachers will be inclined to say with Professor Cattell: "It is desirable at least to watch the Greeks, both when they bear gifts and when they take them away."

An encyclopedic *Mythology of All Races*, under the general editorship of Dr. Louis H. Gray, is to be published by the Marshall Jones Company of Boston. The series when completed will consist of thirteen volumes, including the index volume, each the work of specialists in their particular fields. The volume dealing with Greek and Roman mythology, written by Professor William Sherwood Fox of Princeton, has already appeared. The sixth volume will be devoted to Indian and Iranian mythology and will be the work of one of the most able of the younger Sanskritists, Professor Arthur Berriedale Keith, of the University of Edinburgh.

In the *Romanic Review* for January-March, 1916, C. Ruutz-Rees writes divertingly on "Sixteenth Century Schoolmasters at Grenoble and Their Delectable Vicissitudes." We follow the trials and tribulations of Maltre Jacques de Citreria, Antoine de Montlevin, Guillaume Droin, and other schoolmasters with not a little amusement, although their troubles often resemble those of teachers of a much later day. The career of Hubert Susanné as described is particularly amusing. Although time and again Hubert is strongly urged to send in his resignation, he fights for his rights to the very

last. His career reads somewhat like a chapter out of the life of Richard Bentley. Incidentally one gets some insight into the state of classical studies in a large school in France at this period. Virgil, of course, holds a prominent place, but a knowledge of Greek is still rare among schoolmasters.

The *Bulletin of the First District Normal School* at Kirksville, Missouri, for April, 1915, was devoted to a discussion of various phases of Latin study. Professor J. B. Game, of Tulane University, writes on "The Qualifications of a High School Teacher of Latin." Professor Gentry discusses "Latin as a Vocational Study." To the "Symposium on the Value of a Knowledge of Latin," contributions are made by W. A. Clark, A. L. Phillips, E. M. Violette, W. H. Zeigel, and J. S. Stokes. Merritt Starr and H. B. Hutchins contribute to "Excerpts from What Lawyers Have Said concerning the Value to the Lawyer of Training in the Classics." From Drs. Victor Vaughn and B. G. DeNancrede are drawn "Excerpts from What Physicians Have Said about the Value to the Student of Medicine of Training in the Ancient Classics." B. P. Gentry writes on "Imagination in Education." "Caesar and the Great War" is by T. Jennie Green, who writes also on "Illustrative Material" and "Latin in the Grades."

Some time ago Mrs. John Boyd Thacher placed in the Library of Congress the large collection of early printed books that had been brought together by her husband. This collection is now made more accessible to students by the publication of a *Catalogue of the John Boyd Thacher Collection of Incunabula*. The book has been compiled by F. W. Ashley, chief of the Order Department, and issued by the Government Printing Office. Unlike the annual packages of government seed which come to us duly franked, gratis, and without the asking, this book comes only with the asking, and that, too, when the request is accompanied by the modest sum of one dollar and fifty cents. However, it has been widely distributed among higher institutions of learning and colleges of agriculture as well. (This last is possibly intended to offset the seed that comes regularly to the scholar's door.) Some 800 volumes are described, emanating from 500 different presses; and it is rather remarkable to note that the first book of these incunabula, as well as the one to round out the five hundredth press, Mr. Thacher found in America. For the continuous history of early printing unusual facilities are here offered the student. There is a fair sprinkling of classical authors in the restricted sense, Latin faring much better than Greek in this respect. Thus one fails to find the Florentine Homer of 1488, the Aldine Aristophanes of 1498, and some other volumes dear to the heart of the Grecian.

In *El Nacimiento de Dionisos*, published this year in New York, we have an interesting attempt to imitate an ancient Greek tragedy in a modern

Romance tongue. The author, Señor Pedro Henriquez Urefia, is a native of Santo Domingo, and he displays close familiarity with Greek drama and mythology. He has tried to reproduce that form of tragedy which immediately preceded Aeschylus. The chorus is predominant, and in each episode a single actor is introduced. He has woven into his play all the familiar parts of the later drama—prologue, parodos, episode, stasimon, exodos, and commos. Perhaps the most striking thing about this attempt is the use of prose throughout. “Debese a la dificultad de emplear metros castellanos qui sugieran las formas poéticas de los griegos,” says the author. However, this will not be a satisfactory excuse, in the opinion of most, for one who sets out to reproduce the form of a Greek tragedy. Greek tragedy is nothing if not poetical, and poetry is a matter of form no less than of content. Prose may satisfy one who is forced to resort to translation for his knowledge of classical poetry, but, as was long ago pointed out by Matthew Arnold, the only person capable of passing criticism upon the translation will be the professed classicist. Arnold's own *Merope* is a very successful attempt at reproducing the spirit of a Greek play in modern speech, and it is needless to say that the verse is not the least successful part of his experiment.

In spite of a certain famous definition of a university as being a place where nothing useful is taught, the fact is that universities have always been eminently practical places. True learning and culture have not always in times past found congenial homes within cloistered retreats. Anyone with the slightest knowledge of the history of scholarship will remember how slowly the humanists forced their way into the mediaeval universities. At that time the universities were practical in their aim and had as their object the preparing of leaders in the church. True scholarship with its earnest search for truth met with scant encouragement in college communities. Mark the trials of Dolet, Stephanus, and above all Reuchlin at the hands of university authorities. Full enlightenment on the condition of the mediaeval universities may be gained from the perusal of the *Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum*, which has been correctly called “the first modern satire.” There is no more lamentable error than the common confusion of scholasticism and humanism even among classical students themselves. One of the greatest scholars of modern times, Bentley, because of his high ideals of the scholar's life was persecuted by his opponents in his own college and during the forty years of his mastership of Trinity College his time was largely consumed in defending himself against his enemies. Only between rounds, as it were, was he able to snatch a little time for throwing off those works which have won him immortality. His tenacity of purpose and his readiness to defend the cause of learning by force, if need be, might well be imitated by all true lovers of learning at the present time. “If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?”

The finest general working library recently broken up by sale is certainly that of Auguste Julius Clemens Herbert, Baron De Reuter, late president of Reuter's Telegram Co., Ltd. This remarkable collection of books has passed into the possession of Henry Sotheran, the London bookseller, and by him is being dispersed at very reasonable prices. For a private reference library the books cover an extraordinarily wide range of subjects, and they are in very fine condition. Many of the dictionaries, which embrace numerous languages, are handsomely bound in morocco, t.e.g., and evidently books that would be in constant use were brought together by a man who delighted to work with beautiful tools. Many of the most common reference books are bound in that most durable of modern bindings, buckram, and always in fine taste. Many of the volumes will make a strong appeal to the classical student; and the Sanskritist and comparative philologist will here find books not easily picked up elsewhere. Anyone with a strong inclination, reasonably backed up by pounds, shillings, or pence, may procure much that will delight both eye and mind. Five parts of the catalogue have been issued as follows: I. Art and Archaeology, Cyclopedias and Dictionaries; II. Atlases and History; III. Philosophy, Orientalia, and Classical Literature; IV. European Literature and Philology, Natural History and Geography; V. Medicine, Law, Music, and Theology; VI. Mathematics, Astronomy, and Physics. This library forms a fitting pendant to that of the late Professor Atkinson, of Dublin, which came into Sotheran's hands last year. This last was the remarkable collection of a specialist, and the volumes almost without exception were, if it be not a breach of international etiquette to apply such phrases at the present time to a British collection, *strengh philologisch* and *stark gebraucht*.

At the opening of the Bodley Shakespeare Exhibition held in Oxford last April, Sir William Osler spoke on "Creators, Transmuters, and Transmitters," taking Shakespeare, Francis Bacon, and Robert Burton as representatives of each class respectively. The deep insight of the poet is contrasted with vain attempts at scientific classification. "From Galen to Laurentius, physicians have haggled over the divisions of the ages of man, but with a grand disregard of their teaching. Shakespeare so settles the question that the stages are stereotyped in our minds. We can only think of certain aspects in terms of his description." The very close connection between the science of the present and that of the past is stoutly maintained. "The raw ore of Leucippus and Democritus has been refined to radium by Crookes, Ramsay, and the Curies; the foundations of Krupp are laid in the *De Re Metallica* of Agricola; the defenders of Verdun use the expanded formulae of Archimedes and Apollonius; Lamarck and Darwin, Wallace and Mendel are only Anaximander, Empedocles, and Lucretius writ large; poppy, mandragora, and other drowsy syrups had been in use for centuries to make persons insensible to pain, but the great transmutation did not take place until October 16, 1846, when Morton demon-

strated at the Massachusetts Hospital the practicability of aether anaesthesia, Pasteur, Koch, and Lister are Varro, Fracastorius, and Spallanzini in nineteenth-century garb." "Without Aristotle, Galen, and Fabricius there would have been no Harvey. Transforming their raw ores by methods all his own, he made the *De Motu Cordis*, 1628, a new creation in the world of science." In conclusion, commenting upon the fact that Shakespeare is so frequently quoted by the modern world, he reminds his hearers that Homer held the same position among the ancient Greeks, as can be gathered from Plutarch and Lucian.

The *Educational Review* for September contains an article by Miss Virginia Gildersleeve of Barnard College on "The Purpose of College Greek." As for Greek, Dean Gildersleeve admits that she has "never found it to be of any direct practical and professional use" and that she has forgotten how to read the language; nevertheless she is grateful for the college requirements that compelled her to its study. She thinks that the college course should communicate the joy of beauty and the exhilaration of adventure in much the same manner as they are conveyed to the spirit by actual travel and journeys across the seas to civilizations older and in some ways richer than our own. She does not think that too much stress should be laid upon the disciplinary or linguistic side of the instruction, but that students should be hurried over the preliminaries, and rapidity of reading should be aimed at. The romance of archaeology should be introduced to the student very early. The point is made that young people are always thrilled with exciting stories about the search for hidden treasure, yet so few are familiar with the romantic life of Schliemann. Greek being remote to most people can give "historic perspective, a realization that things develop very slowly, with long lapses and backslidings, that we must not be too impatient of delays nor too much carried away by the latest social nostrums and cure-alls. . . . Then this prying into ancient thought gives rise to respectful toleration for unessential differences and is thus in its effect much like foreign travel and residence in distant lands. Without it we are in danger of becoming provincial and narrow." Then, too, just as one can get more out of his travel if he is familiar with the language of the country, so a knowledge of an original language has infinite advantage over a translation in the case of literature. As for the frequent charge that students forget Greek, she replies: "Not for much gold would I give up the memory of a happy journey. . . . Because I cannot travel there again, shall I therefore regret that I was once privileged to live in Arcady?"

In the *American Political Science Review* for February, 1916, Professor Carl Darling Buck of The University of Chicago writes on "Language and the Sentiment of Nationality." He discusses the revival of the feeling of nationality among many contemporary small peoples. As for the attitude of large

nations toward their language, Professor Hans Delbrück is quoted as saying that "colonial policy must be dictated not merely by commercial but rather by national interests. The first proviso for a colony which aspires to be an assistance to Germany is the absolute supremacy of the German language." The important distinction is drawn between nation and nationality. "The ancient Greeks in the period of their highest development were a nationality, but not a nation in the political sense, likewise the Germans in the time of Goethe." It is well pointed out that the descent of few families is a matter of record and it is the common linguistic inheritance that is usually felt to be the real evidence of national descent. Language is "the one conspicuous banner of nationality, to be defended against encroachment, as it is the first object of attack on the part of a power aiming to crush out a distinction of nationality among its subject peoples." Latin spread uniformly with the spread of the political power of Rome. A knowledge of Latin was the first requisite for attaining a mark in the Roman world. Etruscan, Celtic, even closely allied dialects had to give way before the speech of the stronger political people. An interesting exception to this overwhelming predominance of Latin language in the Roman world was the persistence of Greek in the East. The educated Roman looked upon Greek with great respect. Cicero is quoted as saying that Greek was read among "almost all peoples," whereas Latin was confined within "its own rather narrow boundaries." Greek towns often used their own tongue in their communications with Rome. Public proclamations often were issued in both Greek and Latin. However, the Romans realized the importance of their language and they did not approve of the speaking of Greek in the senate. Cicero incurred censure because he addressed the Syracusans in Greek, and in the East where the officials were familiar with Greek, addresses were given in Latin as the official tongue. On the other hand, the maintenance of the Greek language in Greece has been an important factor in conserving the feeling of Greek nationality down to our own time. Much of the article is devoted to the smaller countries which have had an active part in the present war, and by clear and concise distinctions, guidance is furnished through what to many may seem a confused welter of kindred peoples and tongues.

Book Reviews

Zeus: A Study in Ancient Religion. By ARTHUR BERNARD COOK. I. Zeus, God of the Bright Sky. Cambridge University Press, 1914. Pp. xlivi+885. £2 5s.

The present volume, despite its great bulk, is only the first half of the author's work on Zeus. Furthermore, several appendixes dealing with topics belonging to this volume have been relegated to the end of the second. Chap. i of the work, "Zeus as god of the Bright Sky," occupies the whole of this volume. In nine subdivisions the author discusses "Zeus and the Daylight"; "Zeus and the Burning Sky" (aither); "Zeus Lykaios"; "Zeus and Olympus"; "The Mountain-Cults of Zeus"; "Zeus in Relation to the Sun, the Moon, and the Stars"; and gives a few pages of general conclusions with regard to "Zeus as god of the Bright Sky." Two indexes, one of persons, places, and festivals, the other of subjects and authorities, are of unusual fulness (99 pages), and have satisfied several tests for accuracy.

The illustrations are an extremely valuable feature of the work; there are more than 600, not a few from hitherto unpublished objects, and 42 of the number are plates. All are beautifully executed. In the field of numismatics in particular the author's special knowledge and personal collections have stood him in good stead.

The general conclusions reached by Mr. Cook are best stated in his own words (pp. 776 ff.):

"Zeus, whose name means 'the Bright One,' was originally conceived in zoïstic fashion as the bright sky itself. . . . The change from the zoïstic to the anthropomorphic Zeus was occasioned, not by any despair of magic, but rather by a naïve attempt to express heaven in terms of earth. The divine sky, as supreme weather-maker, was represented under the guise of an ordinary human magician, or weather-ruling king. This transition, which had been accomplished well before the end of the second millennium B.C., meant that Zeus was no longer worshipped as the sky but as the sky-god. . . . As god of the bright or burning sky, Zeus dwelt in aither. . . . And since high mountains were supposed . . . to penetrate the upper zone of aither, mountain-tops were regarded as in a peculiar sense the abode of Zeus. . . . To the mind of the Greek, sun, moon, and stars were made of the same fiery stuff as the aither itself. Zeus, therefore, must needs stand in relations of peculiar intimacy toward these special exhibitions of his own brightness. . . . In various districts of the Mediterranean area the sun was popularly viewed as an eye, a wheel, a bird, a ram, a bull, a bronze man. . . . But each of these manifold and in part barbaric notions was sooner or later absorbed into

the all-comprehensive cult of the Greek sky-god. . . . In short, Zeus was brought into close connection with any and every celestial luminary. But . . . it must be steadily borne in mind that genuine Hellenic religion never identified Zeus with sun or moon or star." The author further summarizes the syncretistic development of Zeus-cults, which subject occupies no small part of the volume, and lays emphasis in closing upon the importance of Zeus's character as a father, a procreative god.

To the elaboration of these views the author has devoted himself with extraordinary industry and a remarkable display of varied and minute learning. He has collected the ancient material, literary and archaeological, with great care, and shows an unusual command of previous writings in all parts of his field. With the main outlines of Mr. Cook's work many critics will find little difficulty in agreeing, though many will certainly balk at the attempt to interpret in terms of solar symbolism the various animal aspects of Zeus. Are not the animals important enough in the life of early man to become sacred and so develop divine relationships without the need of a celestial intermediary? No doubt the sociological or anthropological method of inquiry has its dangers, but more attention to the phenomena of early societies would save investigators from many vagaries of the naturalistic theory. The greatest fault in Mr. Cook's general point of view is his tendency to consider Zeus in nature rather than in human society.

In matters of detail the conservative reader of this work will find himself very frequently dissenting. With the highest regard for the author's erudition and a cordial desire to be instructed the reviewer finds himself utterly unable to see the cogency of many arguments and the value of many combinations here presented. It is impossible adequately to illustrate these objections in the space here available, and the selection of a few items is sure to seem captious. However, it is hard to be patient with such combinations as that of Circe, hawk, and sun-wheel (p. 243), of moon and mulberry tree (p. 470), with the suggestion about the willow (p. 549), and the interpretation of the brawl between Dikaiopolis and the chorus (p. 689). Mr. Cook's too-pronounced tendency to grasp at mere shreds of evidence is shown by the note on Triptolemos at Gaza (p. 237, n. 4), the conjecture about Talos, Kalos, and the rope (pp. 725 f.), and the use made of a certain bit of prehistoric art (p. 501, Fig. 363). Some of these doubtful speculations may conceivably prove fruitful later if the author's further researches bring confirmatory material; but surely it would have been better for the present to hold them *in petto* and disburden a book already too heavy with details and conjectures.

In spite of these faults Mr. Cook deserves the highest praise for the sincerity that he manifests throughout in his handling of his sources. Here is no juggling of evidence. The reader has the material before him and may accept or reject the author's interpretation. He may be dissatisfied with it; he need not be misled. The severest penalty which, because of its bulk and its conjectural character, can justly befall so honest a work is that it may be used less

for its main thesis than for its wonderful collection of material and for its by-products, such as the discussions of the lynx (pp. 253-65), the Labyrinth (p. 472), Minoan bullfights (p. 497), the origins of the drama (pp. 665 ff.), the Dioscuri (pp. 760 ff.). And it may be doubted whether a scholar of so generous and unselfish a spirit as Mr. Cook's would resent this verdict.

Among the very few available authorities that Mr. Cook has not used may be mentioned Pley's *De lanae in antiquorum ritibus usu* (Giessen, 1911), for the *Διὸς κώδιον* (p. 422), and Elworthy's *Horns of Honour* (in connection with pp. 506 ff.).

CAMPBELL BONNER

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

A Handbook for Latin Clubs. By SUSAN PAXSON. Boston, New York, Chicago: D. C. Heath & Co., 1916. Pp. viii+149. 60 cents.

Miss Paxson, for many years teacher of Latin in the Central High School of Omaha, has become known to a wide circle of classical teachers and students through her *Two Latin Plays, I. A Roman School; II. A Roman Wedding* (Ginn & Co., 1911), which have been presented by many schools, as recorded from time to time in our department of "Current Events." Miss Paxson, together with her colleague, Miss Bessie J. Snyder, author of "Latin Clubs and Their Programs" (*Classical Journal*, X, 164 ff.), has also long been interested in the organization of Latin clubs. In the book under review she is presenting to the public the results of this experience in the form of thirty-six well-worked-out programs, numerous helpful selections from ancient and modern writers, not merely cited, but quoted, and a number of Latin songs suitable for program use.

The book will be found of much practical value by the growing number of teachers who have organized or are planning to organize Latin clubs in their own schools.

F. J. MILLER

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

A Handbook of American Private Schools. Boston: Porter E. Sargent, 1916. Pp. 604.

This annually published volume, brought up to date with the present issue, contains a mine of information concerning schools and colleges of the type mentioned in the title. There are short treatises on "History of the Private School," "The Early Education of Girls," "Development of the Summer Camp," "The Year's Advance in Education," "Measuring Educational Results," "Recent Educational Literature." Here is a select classified reading-list from the standpoint of various interests and departments—among these,

Latin and Greek. The bulk of the book is taken up with a "Critical Description of Schools" and a comparative tabulation of them.

To the reader not directly interested in private schools, the main value of the book will center in its "Educational Directories." These give valuable information as to purpose, publications, and officers of all educational associations in the United States, including all our classical associations; also a full list of educational periodicals, with publisher, price, and purpose.

F. J. MILLER

UNIVERSITY CHICAGO

The "Germania" of Tacitus. With an Introduction and Notes
by DUANE REED STUART. New York: Macmillan, 1916.
Pp. xxiii+139. 60 cents.

Instructors who have used Professor Stuart's eminently practical edition of the *Agricola* have looked forward to the publication of this long-promised companion volume. The plan is the same in general—introduction, including a brief list of editions and helpful illustrative books, text, notes, and condensed appendix. Some pages of the introduction are devoted to discussion of the purpose of the *Germania*. The editor does not consider it a satire or a political pamphlet, but "a by-product of the historical studies of Tacitus."

The text follows Halm's fourth edition in the main, the variations, which are for the most part reversions to MS readings, being listed, with reasons therefor, in the appendix. The result is a very intelligible text.

The notes are considerably fuller than those on the *Agricola*, filling 112 pages for 24 pages of text and covering a wide range of material—ethnographical, geographical, philological, archaeological—with not a few illustrative quotations from Greek, Latin, and English literature. The earnest student will find much that is helpful and suggestive. Good examples are the notes on *inimicitias* and *luitur* in chap. 21; *sua cuique arma* and *sepulcrum caespes erigit* in chap. 27. The quotations are apt as a rule, though one cannot help wondering why a couplet from Propertius was chosen to illustrate *plusque ibi boni mores valent quam alibi bonae leges* (chap. 19, *fine*) in preference to Horace's more familiar and pertinent question *Quid leges sine moribus! Vanae proficiunt?* References to the text are made by chapter and line instead of chapter and section, which would be more convenient for comparison with other editions. A good feature is the marking of quantity in the penult of unfamiliar proper names, as a guide to correct pronunciation.

The proofreading appears to have been done accurately. No search was made for errors, and not more than a half-dozen were noticed. On the whole this little book will meet expectations fully and prove a useful edition of a much-studied work.

H. M. KINGERY

WABASH COLLEGE